

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 27, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

The Very Reverend John A. Simpson, dean of Canterbury Cathedral, Canterbury, England, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we give You thanks for the blessings of community in this Nation, and for those who have used Your gifts to strengthen and enrich its life.

We pray:

In all government, for insight, integrity and courage.

In the framing and administration of law, for justice and humility, fairness and compassion.

In industry and commerce, for care, cooperation and concern for the good of all.

In all that is done for those in need, a community that cares.

We pray also for the peoples of other countries, for those called to lead in the crises of these times, that they may seek the ways which lead to peace.

We pray, finally, for the work of this House, that pursuit of righteousness and justice may be our aim.

In Your mercy, O God, hear these prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 23, 1993.

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives,

the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Thursday, April 22, 1993, at 6:41 p.m., that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to S.J. Res. 66.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,

DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

BILL CLINTON'S FIRST 100 DAYS

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years Presidents Reagan and Bush promoted a domestic agenda of cutting taxes, streamlining government, and eliminating the deficit. Those Presidents and their administrations failed on all three fronts.

The Republican wreckage of the eighties paved the way for Bill Clinton's election.

After the Reagan-Bush era of the "Three Ds": Decline, debt, and disinvestment—President Clinton took office 100 days ago determined to fight for all Americans.

He has embarked on an ambitious program of job creation, making Government work, and reforming the health care system.

Already President Clinton has won congressional approval of a 5-year budget that cuts the deficit by \$514 billion. He broke the gridlock and he signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act to help families.

He extended unemployment benefits for jobless Americans who want to work. The President has put into place a new system for worker retraining to help Americans get back to work. He has set into motion affordable health care for the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, during his first 100 days President Clinton has connected with the American people like no other Chief Executive in modern times.

From his open house on the first day of his administration to his open-minded approach in handling the health care crisis, this President is a winner.

President Clinton will succeed because he understands the American people and they support him.

BROKEN PROMISES

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, this week will mark the 100 days of the Clinton administration's beginning, and sadly, it is 100 days of broken promises. Broken promises to provide a middle-class tax cut, broken promises to have no tax increase on people below \$200,000, as Ross Perot pointed out Sunday night. Broken promises on real cuts in Government spending, broken promises on workfare, broken promises to focus on the economy.

Two weeks ago in Italy the people rejected a government that broke its promises. On Sunday, the people of Russia voted and called for reforms and for the politicians to keep their promises.

In America, 7 percent of the American people prefer term limitations because they are tired of politicians who break their promises.

My advice to the President at the end of his first 100 days is make his promises very carefully and then keep his promises. It is sad that in the first 100 days so many promises to so many people have been broken, and in so many ways.

□ 1210

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1013

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentlewoman from Arizona [Ms. ENGLISH] be removed from the list of cosponsors of H.R. 1013.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE FIRST 100 DAYS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, when he was running for President, Bill Clinton said on the Larry King show: "I know I can pass a sweeping package of legislation during the first 100 days of my administration."

The Nation would rather sweep these first days under the rug of history.

The President has broken the record for the highest disapproval rating in

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

modern history because his proposals are like a broken record of higher taxes and more Government spending.

He has proposed taxes on beer, taxes on energy, taxes on consumer goods, and who knows what else.

He has tried to spend money on pork barrel programs, things like swimming pools and parking garages, all in the name of investment and he would have succeeded had Republicans not worked together to stop him.

After the first 100 days of Bill Clinton, only one clear image of this President emerges: He is quite simply a tax and spend Democrat. It is not a pretty picture.

UNITED STATES TAX DOLLARS WILL NOT SAVE RUSSIA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that Boris Yeltsin was successful at the polls. No one denies that Russia needs help.

But why is it, Mr. Speaker, that stimulus money to help depressed American cities is called pork, but money for Russia is called strategic aid? I have some problems with that. In fact, I say if we can find money to line the pockets of these former card-carrying Communists in the Russian Parliament, we could find some money to invest in American cities and help put Americans back to work. A very simple program.

Mr. Speaker, money is not going to save Russia. The Russian people, not the American taxpayers, will save Russia, and it is time to teach Russia how to fish so Russia can fish and eat and will not need American taxpayers' dollars.

The United States taxpayers do not need to send any pork to the former Soviet Union.

THE RAW DEAL

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, over the years, different phrases have characterized a President's first 100 days in office. We have had FDR's New Deal, LBJ's Great Society, and Harry Truman's Fair Deal.

Now we have Bill Clinton's Raw Deal.

The Clinton Raw Deal started when the President decided to break his promise to the middle class. Calling it shared sacrifice, he said he would not cut taxes on the middle class after all—surprise, surprise.

Now, the President is considering several tax proposals that will hit all income levels. These include a Btu tax, a Social Security tax, and a VAT tax

on hard-working, middle-income American families.

Candidate Clinton said:

I intend to have a legislative program ready on the desk of Congress the day after I'm inaugurated. It will be the most productive period in modern history.

The President promised us all this and more. Unfortunately, all we got was the raw deal.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE FIRST 100 DAYS

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we have a truth squad on President Clinton's 100 days.

He came to town, and from this very well down here, he explained to people the real truth about the budget, no rosy scenarios, no more borrow and spend, and that he was going to really put it down where we could do it and do it right. And he did. He got his budget through here. He lifted the gag rule on family planning clinics for women, he got family leave through here, he did all sorts of things.

Then his 100 days got undermined by 100 Senators. I think it is time that we point out that what they killed were some very important programs for America's children, investment in Head Start, investment in immunizations, investment in the WIC Program, investment in teen jobs for the summer in our urban core.

It is going to cost us way more not to have funded those programs than it would to have funded those programs.

So I would not brag if I tried to detail that program. I would have been ashamed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would like to caution that visitors in the gallery are not able to participate by applauding any of the debate.

BLUFF, BLUSTER, AND BLARNEY

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton promised the American people a sweeping package of legislation during his first 100 days.

Instead, we have received 100 days of bluff, bluster, and blarney.

In his State of the Union Address, the President challenged Republicans to come up with specific spending cuts. When Republicans, led by JOHN KASICH, did just that, the Nation discovered

that the President was bluffing. The Clinton proposal was never as specific or detailed as the Republican plan.

Later, the President blustered about Republicans holding up his spending package. He said his pork bill would create jobs, and he ranted and raved about Republican gridlock. He did not say that his jobs bill would cost \$90,000 a job, and that it was a payoff to his political cronies.

Finally, we will consider the Clinton version of enhanced rescission, which is nothing more than a bunch of blarney when it comes to real spending reform.

A hundred days of bluff, bluster, and blarney. The President must do better.

BUY LEGITIMATE AMERICAN PRODUCTS

(Mr. APPELLEGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELLEGE. Mr. Speaker, the North American Free-Trade Agreement is dead for now. So says Leon Panetta in the Washington Post. I say it should be buried.

America is losing its industries and jobs without it, and we do not need a bad trade agreement to compound it. What we need to do is to restrict trade to countries like Mexico and China which abuse their people. Do not reward them for manufacturing products made by people who earn 40 cents an hour, slave labor, child labor, no safety, no health, no pension benefits, no environmental protection.

This is against everything that Americans believe in and have fought for. Greed by American industrialists and entrepreneurs who take their business there undermine the American spirit and the marketplace. It is bucks in the pocket, and it is time that America woke up and stopped buying from these perpetrators of human rights.

I say buy legitimate American products. Think about it.

□ 1220

WE'RE HERE TO HELP YOU WITH YOUR TRUST DEFICIT, MR. PRESIDENT

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the polls this morning tell us that 48 percent of the American people believe that President Clinton has failed to keep his promises during these first 100 days. I am here this afternoon to offer the help of my party. We Republicans are willing to assist the President with his trust deficit.

Mr. President, when you told the American people that "I am not going to raise taxes on the middle class to

pay for these programs," many Americans took you at your word. Now, your administration talks almost daily about new taxes—energy taxes, VAT taxes, sin taxes, higher taxes for Social Security recipients, higher income tax bills for the middle class. All to pay for more pork barrel deficit spending programs that the American people don't want.

Like I say, Mr. President, we are here to help. If you want to put a dent in the budget deficit, let's talk. We will help you get it done. If you want to forgo all of your new tax ideas, we are with you. Just let us know.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans in this House are willing to help you and the President with your trust deficit. Just say the word.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would remind Members, again, that they cannot directly address the President of the United States; it should come through the Chair or the Speaker.

A PRESIDENT OF ACTION, NOT RHETORIC

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, finally we have a President of action instead of rhetoric. In his first 100 days of office President Clinton has shown us that he is a doer, not a talker.

Instead of merely talking about family values he has broken the gridlock and signed the Family and Medical Leave Act, enabling family members to keep their jobs while caring for their sick and/or newborn.

Instead of theorizing over solutions to the high cost of today's nonuniversal health care, but more importantly, to underscore his dedication to the proposition that all Americans must have basic health care, he has formed a task force chaired by the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, to research and draft a comprehensive health care bill.

Instead of pontificating on how the economic policies of the Reagan/Bush administrations caused a mere bump instead of the desired increase on the economic charts, President Clinton has drafted and won congressional approval for a 5-year budget that will reduce the deficit and increase investments in order to improve our economy.

Instead of merely saying that there was no recession, President Clinton extended and reformed the unemployment insurance systems, by providing benefits to jobless workers and a new system of worker counseling and re-

training so that they can find jobs and return to work quicker.

Mr. Speaker, as we look back on this first 100 days of his Presidency, finally, ordinary working and poor Americans can point to a President who actually is trying to solve America's problems. His actions speak louder than words.

NATIONAL VICTIMS WEEK

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the beginning of National Victims Week.

What a tragic irony that yesterday was also the day the mother of three dear friends—and former wife of a good friend who is also a Minneapolis police officer—was stabbed to death by a burglar.

Yesterday, like every other day in America, 288 women were raped—one rape victim every 5 minutes. Over 100,000 rape victims last year in America.

And children fare no better. The average child sex offender convicted last year molested 117 young victims.

No other civilized society tolerates this level of violence against innocent victims.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can bring back my friends' mother nor ease the pain and suffering of all the crime victims. But we can put politics aside and pass an omnibus crime bill. It's time to put politics aside and pass the Violence Against Women Act.

It is time to put politics aside and pass the Jacob Wetterling child protection bill and the Assaults Against Children Act I have introduced.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put victims' rights ahead of criminals' rights. The victims of America deserve nothing less.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FIRST 100 DAYS

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the first 100 days of President Clinton's administration have been significant ones.

They have brought about a sense of renewal to a government once looked upon as lethargic.

They have restored hope to a nation of people who had lost faith in their country's leadership.

They have sent a clear message that this administration is of, for, and by the people.

On day 17 President Clinton signed the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

On day 50 President Clinton announced an initiative to alleviate the

credit crunch and generate jobs in the private sector by assisting small businesses with fair lending, equal opportunity and credit availability.

And on day 71 Congress agreed to a budget resolution which included most of the President's comprehensive economic plan: A Vision of Change for America.

Mr. Speaker, interest rates are down, consumer confidence is up, and the country is moving in the right direction.

The Clinton administration has clearly defined itself as courageous enough to take bold initiatives, compassionate enough to put people first, and competent enough to steer our Nation back to soundness and security.

MR. PEROT WAS RIGHT

(Mr. CANADY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANADY. Madam Speaker, for millions of Americans, H. Ross Perot personifies the movement to change Washington for the better.

Sunday night Mr. Perot went on television to explain what's wrong with President Clinton's economic plan.

He said Mr. Clinton's plan is in trouble because it's more of the same.

And Mr. Perot was right.

The President's plan gives us: more Government, more wasteful spending, and more taxes.

Ross Perot said it and the American people know it's true:

The President has proposed nothing to address the basic causes of the problems we are facing.

If we are to solve those problems, there must be fundamental change in the way Washington works.

We must give the President a real line-item veto.

We must send to the States a balanced budget amendment.

And, we must enact term limits for the Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to fix the problem we must deal with the causes of the problem.

It's as simple as that.

PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS GIVEN US A NEW VISION OF WHAT WE CAN DO

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Madam Speaker, the media and our friends on the Republican side are enjoying trying to define our new President at the end of his first 100 days in office. I think he is most definable by the fact that he has given this country a new vision of what we can do to fight for opportunity for our people and put them back to work.

Madam Speaker, we have been frustrated. There have been efforts to defeat and derail his economic package. But the fact remains that he passed his budget resolution within record time; we have broken the gridlock on family and medical leave, something the American people overwhelmingly wanted and were deprived of by the last two Republican Presidents; we have begun to reform the unemployment system and help keep people whose benefits have been exhausted from going without; and, most of all, taken on our major deficit problem by addressing the health care crisis in this country.

Not a bad accomplishment for the first 100 days.

But the real judgment, of course, will occur at the end of this President's first term in office. I think it is fair to say he is off to a good start, one that this Congress can aid and abet, or frustrate. I hope that the vision of the future from Congress will be as elevating and successful as the President's.

SPENDING CUTS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, the Clinton economic plan is at risk of dying the death of a thousand cuts, precisely because it does not cut enough. As the American people digest the details of the plan, particularly the ratio of 24-to-1 tax increases to spending cuts next year, confidence in the plan is eroding fast.

According to the President's own numbers, his plan adds almost \$1 trillion to the deficit, and that is after 5 years of the largest tax increase in our history. The American people are smart—and they know that "it's the spending, stupid" that causes our national budget to be so out of whack. Let us focus on spending cuts, not higher taxes—on cuts, not new spending.

Whether they be the 50 specific spending cuts I have introduced, the Republican Budget Committee's plan, or the suggestions offered by many independent organizations, and knowledgeable individuals such as Ross Perot the ideas for chopping waste are there for the taking.

It's time to sentence the budget deficit-national debt to death by a thousand cuts.

A FOUNDATION FOR BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, the Congress and the country face the

beginning of a new era; a President who wants to build for the future, not simply with short-term economic fixes, but long-term economic policies that will rebuild America and start a new direction for our children and our grandchildren.

For 12 years, Republican economic policies have passed and have quadrupled the national debt and changed us from a creditor nation to a debtor nation. We battled for years trying to get family medical leave; in the first days of the Clinton administration, that was signed into law.

Each time we needed an unemployment extension, we had battles with the previous administrations; month after month we would fight with the President trying to convince him that those people were in need. In the Clinton administration, the unemployment provisions were signed into law immediately.

Madam Speaker, there are yet challenges. A minority in the Senate holding up America, precluding us from the kind of investment package that we need to really convert this economy. But we have a President committed to the long haul, and we have a great foundation that we have begun to build.

□ 1230

NERVOUS OVER PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTH. Madam Speaker, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that the Republicans and the media are having a field day defining Mr. Clinton's first 100 days.

Well, I do not know. I think Mr. Panetta, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, did a pretty good job this morning on the front page of the paper.

He said that he is very nervous about the national picture.

Well, my response would be, "Well, who isn't?"

With the Democrats in charge of the White House and in total disarray, with the Senate Democrat controlled 57 to only 43 Republicans, with the House of Representatives that has been in Democrat total control for 40 years now, with the Democrats having 256 Members in this House and we only 175; but the thing that caught my eye, my fellow colleagues, was on aid to Russia. Mr. Panetta said he is still searching for ways to finance the additional \$1.8 billion that was promised to Boris Yeltsin in Tokyo.

Then someone at the White House jokingly said, "Now that he is elected, do we have to give him the money?"

Is that the mind set in the White House? We make campaign promises

and after the votes are counted, we say, "Well, now it is all over."

By the way, I say to Mr. Panetta, who was that man that jokingly said, "Do we have to pay him now?"

BUILDING A GOOD ECONOMIC PROGRAM

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle are getting dangerously close to gloating over the fact that a Republican filibuster stopped the President's effort to pass a jobs bill to put hundreds, if not thousands of Americans, back to work.

It reminds me of an old saying attributed to Harry Truman in the Midwest. I would like to modify it. His saying was, "Any jackass can knock down a barn door. It takes a carpenter to build one."

Putting it in a modern context, you might say, "Any elephant can knock down a President's program, but it takes a bipartisan majority to build one."

Just a few short weeks ago, the President stood right here and said, "Let's put an end to the blame game and work together."

He was not just speaking for Bill Clinton and the Democratic Party. He was speaking for the American people. They voted last November for change.

Now we have my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, barely 3 months into this Presidency, coming to proclaim the failed Clinton Presidency. The American people want this President to have a chance to succeed and Members of good will on both sides of the aisle can work to make that happen.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, is it not against the rules of the House to characterize actions of the other body?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks that is true.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, the Chair is not calling people into account for their failure to obey those rules.

My parliamentary inquiry is, Is the Chair going to exercise its rights in that regard?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Well, the gentleman from Pennsylvania did call them into account, and the Chair will listen more intently.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE SECTOR JOBS CREATION AND ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is absolutely right. We Republicans do take credit for having blocked the President's pork barrel so-called jobs and stimulus bill.

We can use that as a great accomplishment in his first 100 days; but Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we Republicans can sit by and simply gloat about having filibustered that program to death.

That is why today I am introducing the private sector jobs creation and economic stimulus bill. It has four basic points to it. And how many were included in President Clinton's campaign?

First of all, the capital gains tax differential which Mr. Clinton talked about last fall.

Second, expanded individual retirement accounts.

Third, a freeze on Federal spending.

Fourth, a moratorium on new regulations for the private business sector of our economy.

These four items clearly can do what my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], has talked about, create jobs in the private sector.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO MORAL RIGHT TO PREVENT VOTE ON PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat amused at the hyperventilation which is occurring on the minority side of the aisle in reaction to the comments of Leon Panetta, the Budget Director, in the paper today. I do not blame Mr. Panetta one bit.

I would be nervous, too, if I thought that an elected minority, rather than having the courage to simply vote up or down on the President's package, chose the refuge of arcane rules simply to prevent that package from coming to a vote. That is the critical distinction that needs to be made.

Our friends on the Republican side of the aisle, be they in this body or the other body, have a perfect right, and in fact an obligation, to vote against the President's package if they disagree with it, but they have absolutely no moral right to prevent that package from coming to a final vote. That is the disgrace that took place last week in the other body.

Mr. WALKER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The Chair will again make the statement. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. Members should not characterize the actions of the other body.

NURSING HOME CARE FOR VETERANS IN NEW JERSEY

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to direct the VA to report to Congress on long-term health care needs of veterans in my State and to conduct a feasibility study on constructing a veterans' nursing home in central New Jersey.

The VA more than any other health care delivery system, will be serving a rapidly aging population. Today 7 million veterans are age 65 or older. By the year 2000, that number will grow to 9 million, with 1.5 million over the age of 85.

Madam Speaker, as anyone in medicine will tell you, the utilization of health care significantly increases with age. Veterans older than age 85 need health care services 30 times as often as those under the age of 65. By the same token, the need for nursing home care also vastly increases as the pool of potential users ages and expands.

Madam Speaker, my State has done an initial analysis on this. We have found that the numbers of veterans will grow by 15 percent by the year 2000 in New Jersey.

The need for nursing home care in Central New Jersey is unmistakable. Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, I believe it is critical for the VA to also conduct comprehensive assessments and mission planning. These findings will aid the VA in prioritizing new construction projects and in supporting State grant applications for new nursing home facilities.

America's veterans have earned the right to dignified, long-term nursing home care. This is one of the finest measures of respect that can be provided by a grateful Nation.

Now, is the time to plan and act for tomorrow.

DIRECT CONNECTION BETWEEN HEALTH AND WELL-BEING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

(Ms. SHEPHERD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEPHERD. Madam Speaker, there is a direct connection between our health and well-being and the environment.

In 1951, the U.S. Government began its relentless bombing of the Nevada

desert with above-ground nuclear testing for 11 straight years. We Utahns came to be known as down-winders: we felt the tremors and we heard the blasts. Today, 40 years and countless bombs later, our mothers and sisters—Utah's mothers and sisters—are suffering from breast cancer. Our fathers and brothers have died of leukemia and cancers of the pancreas and colon.

We have only recently begun to understand the impact of these lethal actions on our environment. Perhaps in the very near future, we will begin to understand the impact of these actions on world health.

Madam Speaker, our health and our environment are woven together in such a way that we as policymakers must always take that into account. We must understand that the Pacific yew tree is part of the environment and that the Pacific yew tree gives us taxol, a life-saving drug which sends ovarian breast cancers into remission. Taxol offers only one example of the possibilities nature offers us. There are many more. And in the coming days, we the women, we the down-winders, are the ones who will lose health and vitality if the environment is not protected and that we begin an historic route toward preservation.

□ 1240

IN OPPOSITION TO CARGO PREFERENCE

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I direct my colleague's attention to the Journal of Commerce article explaining the difference between United States and foreign ocean shipping rates, and how the much higher United States rates will diminish the aid promised to Russia.

If we need evidence that cargo preference requirements should be waived, we need only to look at the recent bids submitted to the USDA by U.S.-flag shipping companies to carry the grain donated under the package.

These bids came in at \$138 per ton, \$102 per ton, \$75 per ton or, to put them in perspective, at three to five times the current rate being charged by foreign flag vessels.

And of note, the higher bid was double what that company was charging just a month ago, right before the Vancouver summit. Clearly there are those in the maritime industry willing to profit, and profit big, from shipping humanitarian aid.

To his credit, USDA Secretary Espy rejected the higher bid, but, according to reports, the USDA will accept the \$75 per ton bid. At this rate, one-third or more of the food aid promised to Russia will be needlessly lost to transportation costs.

Russian officials are scheduled to arrive this week in Washington to seek relief from cargo preference requirements and maximize the food aid that can be delivered. There is an immediate solution available for them: The President could use his authority under existing law to waive cargo preference.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 85 to urge them to do so, and I urge my colleague to join me by cosponsoring this resolution.

The Russian's have overcome one hurdle by giving President Yeltsin a strong vote of confidence; let's help them overcome the cargo preference hurdle.

THE SUCCESSES OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S FIRST 100 DAYS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, some of our colleagues are trying to mischaracterize the first 100 days of the Clinton administration for their own partisan gain, but what the American people should know about is the successes of the Clinton administration.

In the first 100 days, in record time the Clinton administration won passage of a bold plan to fix the economy, create jobs, and produce higher income by getting this budget through, as I said, in record time. He also signed the Family and Medical Leave Act and set the environmental policy on a new course, reversing Bush administration policies by getting the United States to sign a biodiversity treaty and to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases.

The President has worked to spur economic growth through his meetings with foreign leaders and his enterprise oriented aid initiative to save the Russian democracy and open markets to American products.

If the President made any mistake in his first 100 days, it was in thinking that everyone in this Congress cared about working people in our country, especially those without jobs.

Madam Speaker, I hope the President will sign a new jobs program soon, and that it will be substantial so that this House will once again have the opportunity to vote for jobs for working Americans.

THE LATEST IN LIP READING—MORE NEW TAXES

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, President Clinton has almost reached the 100-day threshold of his new Presidency, and the day of reckoning is here.

We have heard of the New Deal, we have heard of the Fair Deal, these are not the right labels.

President Clinton's first 100 days can only be characterized as the raw deal. The one thing the American people can hear coming from the President is new taxes.

Raise income taxes, raise business taxes, raise energy taxes, raise excise taxes, tax banks, and try a new value added tax.

Madam Speaker, there is no deal like a raw deal, read President Clinton's lips: More new taxes.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S STIMULUS PACKAGE

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam speaker, I rise today to say that the American people lost when the President's stimulus package failed last week. The price of playing partisan politics with jobs will be much higher than the monetary cost of the package.

In the city of Chicago alone, the package would have provided 18,000 summer jobs for youth. That means for Chicago the result of partisan politics is that 18,000 young people will be denied the opportunity to get essential work experience.

Madam Speaker, if we are actually experiencing an economic recovery, then it is clearly a jobless recovery. On April 7, I held a job fair in my district; 4,000 qualified, mostly college educated job seekers lined up—eager to find work. Somehow these people had fallen through the cracks of the so-called recovery. How would those playing partisan politics with the stimulus package explain to those waiting in line that a bill to stimulate job growth is just too expensive.

Thus, the result of trying to make the President lose or look bad means that America will lose.

THE TAILHOOK REPORT

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Speaker, last Friday the inspector general presented a detailed and shockingly descriptive report on the 1991 Tailhook incident. The events outlined in this report are a scathing indictment of an archaic culture and attitude toward women in the Navy.

But it took 19 months for this investigation to be completed. Now that we have in our possession its findings, it is my hope that it will not take 19 more months for justice to be served. The evidence has been presented, and now justice and discipline must be rendered.

It is also my hope that the leaders of the U.S. Navy have learned their lesson, unfortunately, 90 women paid the price for their lack of leadership and for their lack of commitment to the most basic principles of conduct. Let us hope that there will be no more Tailhooks. Let us hope that it will not take another Tailhook incident for our Nation's Armed Forces to understand that women's dignity is not to be toyed with, not to be bartered, and to understand that women are not property.

Now we must move forward expeditiously, and take the necessary actions to bring these men to justice. And I say this to the Navy leadership—we in Congress will continue to watch and ensure that the Navy not only adheres, but is committed to the programs and changes it has implemented to eradicate all forms of sexual harassment in the Armed Forces. The time for the Navy to act is now.

CALLING FOR AN END TO GRIDLOCK

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, President Clinton was elected by this Nation's voters to provide leadership on the terribly important issues facing this country. In his first 100 days he has advanced a plan to promote economic recovery, has proposed the most significant deficit-reduction plan in history, and has launched an impressive effort to address the health-care crisis we are presently mired in.

By my reckoning, the President has lived up to his end of the bargain. He has provided strong leadership on our toughest, most intractable problems.

But in addition, last fall Americans asked this body to put aside partisan warfare and political rhetoric and work together, Republicans as well as Democrats, to address these problems. There has been precious little evidence, unfortunately, that the minority party in this body wants to play a constructive role in Government.

Madam Speaker, their shrill denunciations of our President and their efforts to prevent line-item rescission from even coming to the floor are only the latest examples that the old ways die hard for this body's Republicans.

A REAL LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. TALENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALENT. Madam Speaker, there is a positive development which needs to be discussed. Pending before the House right now is a real line-item veto. The Castle-Solomon amendment is a real line-item veto which would

permit the President to veto out particular pieces of waste or pork barrel and require a two-thirds vote of both Houses in order to override that veto.

It is a line-item veto that more than 40 Governors have. It is a line-item veto the President endorsed in his campaign. It is a line-item veto that the people want.

Last week, Madam Speaker, the Republican freshmen sent a letter to the President asking him to support that line-item veto, telling him it was pending before the House, and asking him for a meeting to discuss strategy to get it passed. We can pass that line-item veto with a minimal amount of support of the majority side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, I urge the President to meet right now. This is an important part of his package. It is something that the people want. It is something that the independent voters of this country want, and we can actually deliver a real change in the way the Congress budgets out of the House and create massive bipartisan support for the President's leadership at this crucial time.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CESAR CHAVEZ

(Mr. BECERRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, words simply cannot express my profound sadness over the passing of Cesar Chavez.

Cesar Chavez was a man of immense dignity, humanity, and integrity.

Few individuals will ever touch as many lives as did this great man.

Millions have benefited from his work as a civil rights activist, and millions will mourn his death.

For decades, Cesar Chavez undertook one of life's most difficult callings: organizing the masses to fight injustice.

His fierce determination and strong spirit turned failed struggles into unprecedented successes.

As the founder and president of the United Farm Workers of America, Cesar Chavez dedicated his life to educating farmworkers about their basic human rights and how to effectively demand and receive a better quality of life.

His achievements transcended the plight of the farmworker.

Cesar Chavez' historic struggles for justice changed our world.

We can all learn and live by the values that guided Mr. Chavez' work: "Love triumphs over hate, nonviolence over violence, courage over fear, and human dignity over belittlement and abuse."

Mr. Chavez will also be fondly remembered for saying: "Hay mas tiempo que vida."—"We have more time than life." Oh, how true.

Although this great leader is no longer here to guide us, his work on behalf of working men and women and consumers—but most importantly farmworkers who even today often live and work in harsh conditions—must and will move forward.

Cesar Chavez was a man who kindled our spirits; and he is, in spirit, forever with us.

Si se puede.

□ 1250

GIVE PRESIDENT A REAL LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Madam Speaker, if President Clinton really wants to reduce the bloated spending recommendations of Congress, he will need a line-item veto to cut the pork and irresponsible spending.

This Congress has proposed a politically correct, watered down version of the line-item veto called enhanced rescission.

In this line-item veto, the President could recommend a list of spending reductions, but both Houses of Congress must hold hearings on the cuts and vote to approve these cuts. In other words, Congress, not the President, controls the enhanced rescission process.

The 47 Republican freshmen stand united to give President Clinton a real line-item veto which could only be defeated by two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress. The gridlock on the line-item veto issue is purely the Democratic Party's. We freshmen Republicans stand ready to fulfill at least one of President Clinton's promises. Give us a real line-item veto.

REGULATORY BURDEN RELIEF FOR FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

(Mr. ISTOOK asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISTOOK. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak today about a subject that was a recurring theme during my campaign and continues to be a theme in Washington—regulatory burden relief for financial institutions.

Bankers tell me, "We are afraid to make what used to be a straightforward loan." Savings and loans officials say, "We do not have anyone educated enough to make a simple home loan any more because it has become so complicated." An example I am given is it took 6 months to get a respected dentist's paperwork done so he could serve as a director, and, out of frustration, they almost lost him.

I hear that bankers and savings and loans make more profit out of invest-

ing in T-bills and T-notes than in loaning money to businesses.

Madam Speaker, I have heard enough. Historically, I am told when the Banking Committee moves on legislation designed to reduce unnecessary redtape, they usually end up with a bill that adds twice as much instead.

I know many bankers fear additional action would make matters worse, but I hope we will fix that with bills we have introduced during this Congress, H.R. 59 and H.R. 962. I encourage us to move forward with those and provide true relief for bankers which will aid jobs in America.

I have just cosponsored legislation, H.R. 59, the Depository Institution Burden Relief Act of 1993, and H.R. 962, the Economic Growth and Financial Institutions Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1993. These bills would make inroads into some of these problems. Frankly, I wish they went further. I urge the House Banking Committee to work speedily on this legislation and to reverse the trend of crushing the financial institutions with more well-intentioned, nice sounding, but counterproductive regulations.

PRESIDENT MUST TALK STRAIGHT WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. ROHRBACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, we have had 100 days of doublespeak, 100 days of calling taxes contributions, 100 days of calling Federal spending investment, 100 days when a \$28 billion tax hike on Social Security recipients is being called a spending cut.

Now, we hear complaints that the jobs bill, the stimulus package, has gone down to defeat. Well, that is because it was not a jobs bill and it was not a stimulus package any more than taxes are a contribution and Federal spending is an investment.

It was a political payoff bill, not a jobs bill. We had a massive hike in Federal spending for social welfare programs to pay off a political debt. We had hundreds of millions of dollars more in Federal spending on AIDS research to pay off a political debt, and hundreds of millions for childhood inoculations.

Madam Speaker, this was not a jobs bill or a stimulus. It was a political payoff bill, and the President is not going to be any more successful in the rest of his administration than he has been in his last 100 days until he starts talking straight with the American people.

GAY RIGHTS MARCH AN IGNOBLE EVENT

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, Sunday I had the occasion to drive into my office here on the Hill, so I drove up Independence Avenue and down Constitution Avenue observing the 300,000 people who were gathered here in celebration of homosexuality. I noted later on C-SPAN television that you and four other Members of this House and one U.S. Senator spoke at this bizarre rally demanding special rights for abnormal sexual orientation.

I rise today to point out that 30 years ago this August, when I was 30, I marched with Rev. Martin Luther King on that same Mall and, probably against military regulations, I proudly wore my Air Force captain's uniform. Some fools try to compare August 28, 1963, with April 25, 1993. To compare these two marches is not only odious and offensive, it turns history on its head.

That 1963 event led by Reverend King was so respectful of families and children and Judeo-Christian values and so decent in every aspect and the speeches so noble in character and so inspirational that they have been taught to our children ever since. To view C-SPAN's coverage from gavel to gavel of that odd circus last Sunday was to fear for the survival of our civilization as we know it.

To watch and listen to the obscenities on the Lord's day was to witness the deterioration of our country's national discourse. The filthy speech movement at the University of California at Berkeley one-half year after Reverend King's civil rights march started this degrading decline in public morality.

What could possibly be taught in our schools from that Sodom scene in our beautiful Federal Capital city? The loss of innocence is truly the greatest loss of all.

WELCOME TO CYPRIOT DELEGATION

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I take this opportunity today to welcome a distinguished delegation of members of the Cypriot Parliament. That delegation is being led by the president of the Parliament, the Honorable Alexis Ghalanos. Our House Foreign Affairs Committee looks forward to meeting with the Cypriot delegation later today.

The United States supports the Cyprus peace talks, and we hope that they will resume on May 24 as scheduled. We further hope that the talks can reconcile the ongoing differences between the island's Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot populations, and that

such a resolution will bring about the removal of Turkish troops from the shores of Cyprus. I know my colleagues join me in extending our warmest wishes to this Cypriot delegation, with the hope that one day the two Cypriot communities will be able to live together in peace.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S TAX PROPOSALS WILL WORSEN THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House an article in the Chicago Tribune about the effect of the Clinton tax proposals on married couples.

During the Presidential campaign, President Clinton promised the American people more family friendly tax policies. We have seen the middle-class tax cut go by the boards, we have seen proposals for a broad-based energy tax, and we have seen a lack of real spending cuts that makes any middle-class tax relief difficult to foresee.

I am sure these questions will be fought out in the months to come, but I'd like to alert my colleagues that the Clinton tax proposals also will worsen the existing marriage penalty for American families.

I do not believe anyone wants this to happen and I hope Republicans and Democrats can work with the administration to correct what must be an unintentional increase in the marriage penalty.

According to the Tribune article, an upper middle-class family with two wage earners will pay quite a bit more in taxes than if they were unmarried. This proposal would almost double their existing marriage penalty.

If President Clinton would like to demonstrate that he is ready for true bipartisan cooperation, fixing the marriage penalty would be a good place to start.

□ 1300

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND BALANCED BUDGETS

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, a few minutes ago we had a fascinating declaration on the floor by one Member, who said that the leadership of the Democratic Party was going to produce balanced budgets. That was a fascinating statement, given the fact that the Democratic Party has controlled this House exclusively for the last 40 years.

One time during that 40-year period have they balanced the budget. They have had both Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents, and have not managed to balance the budget or get our accounts straight.

And then we have the Clinton administration's budget before us, and what that tells us is that in the first term of President Clinton's administration, if, in fact, he ever gets a second term, but in his one term that he has been elected to now, he is going to raise the debt of the country by just about \$1 trillion. And so the same pattern that we have seen for the last 12 years, of \$1 trillion every 4 years, is going to be matched by this President.

I do not think Democrats are coming anywhere close to balancing budgets.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on both motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on both motions to suspend the rules.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION RATES CODIFICATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 798) to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans as such rates took effect on December 1, 1992, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 798

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Rates Codification Act of 1993".

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

Section 1114 is amended—

- (1) by striking out "\$83" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$85";
- (2) by striking out "\$157" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$162";
- (3) by striking out "\$240" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$247";
- (4) by striking out "\$342" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$352";
- (5) by striking out "\$487" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$502";
- (6) by striking out "\$614" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$632";
- (7) by striking out "\$776" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$799";

(8) by striking out "\$897" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$924";

(9) by striking out "\$1,010" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,040";

(10) by striking out "\$1,680" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,730";

(11) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking out "\$68" both places it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "\$70"; and

(B) by striking out "\$2,089" and "\$2,927" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,152" and "\$3,015", respectively;

(12) by striking out "\$2,089" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,152";

(13) by striking out "\$2,302" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,371";

(14) by striking out "\$2,619" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,698";

(15) by striking out "\$2,927" each place it appears in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3,015";

(16) by striking out "\$1,257" and "\$1,872" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,295" and "\$1,928", respectively; and

(17) by striking out "\$1,879" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,935".

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.

Section 1115(1) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$100" in clause (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$103";

(2) by striking out "\$169" and "\$52" in clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$174" and "\$54", respectively;

(3) by striking out "\$69" and "\$52" in clause (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$71" and "\$54", respectively;

(4) by striking out "\$80" in clause (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$82";

(5) by striking out "\$185" in clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$191"; and

(6) by striking out "\$155" in clause (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$160".

SEC. 4. CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.

Section 1162 is amended by striking out "\$452" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$466."

SEC. 5. DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.

Section 1311 is amended—

(1) by striking out the table in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Pay grade	Monthly rate	Pay grade	Monthly rate
E-1	\$634	W-4	\$911
E-2	654	O-1	803
E-3	672	O-2	829
E-4	714	O-3	888
E-5	732	O-4	939
E-6	749	O-5	1,035
E-7	785	O-6	1,168
E-8	829	O-7	1,262
E-9	866	O-8	1,383
W-1	803	O-9	1,483
W-2	835	O-10	2,162
W-3	860		

"If the veteran served as sergeant major of the Army, senior enlisted advisor of the Navy, chief master sergeant of the Air Force, sergeant major of the Marine Corps, or master chief petty officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$934.

"If the veteran served as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$1,744."

(2) by striking out "\$71" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$73";

(3) by striking out "\$185" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$191"; and

(4) by striking out "\$90" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$93".

SEC. 6. DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR CHILDREN.

(a) DIC FOR ORPHAN CHILDREN.—Section 1313(a) is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$310" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$319";

(2) by striking out "\$447" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$460";

(3) by striking out "\$578" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$595"; and

(4) by striking out "\$578" and "\$114" in clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$595" and "\$117", respectively.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL DIC FOR DISABLED ADULT CHILDREN.—Section 1314 is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$185" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$191";

(2) by striking out "\$310" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$319"; and

(3) by striking out "\$157" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "\$162".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 798 and H.R. 1032, the veterans bills now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY], chairman of our Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance.

Mr. SLATTERY. Madam Speaker, H.R. 798 would make technical amendments to the rates of service-connected disability compensation and to the old rates of dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] set forth in chapters 11 and 13, respectively, of title 38, United States Code. The amendments codify rates of payment under these benefit programs to reflect the 3 percent cost-of-living adjustment which was authorized by Public Law 102-510, effective December 1, 1992.

This is a very straightforward bill. There will be no cost associated with its enactment since it makes only technical amendments and since the cost of the COLA was already included in the fiscal year 1993 baseline.

Last year, we authorized the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adminis-

tratively increase the appropriate rates of compensation and DIC by an amount equal to the cost-of-living adjustment provided for Social Security benefits and VA pension. This was done, and the new rates went into effect on December 1.

Normally, we prefer to adjust the rates in the statute itself. However, because of the early adjournment of the 102d Congress, this was the only way we could insure that the compensation and DIC rates would receive an appropriate increase equal to that given to Social Security recipients. What we are now doing is essentially house-keeping to make sure that the provisions in title 38 continue to reflect accurate rates.

The following tables reflect the new statutory rates in title 38, United States Code, commensurate with the increases already effectuated by the Department of Veterans Affairs:

Compensation and DIC rates which became effective December 1, 1992 to be codified in Title 38, United States Code

Percentage of disability or subsection under which payment is authorized:	
(a) 10 percent	\$85
(b) 20 percent	162
(c) 30 percent	247
(d) 40 percent	352
(e) 50 percent	502
(f) 60 percent	632
(g) 70 percent	790
(h) 80 percent	924
(i) 90 percent	1,040
(j) 100 percent	1,730

Higher statutory awards for certain multiple disabilities:

(k)(1) Additional monthly payment for anatomical loss, or loss of use of, any of the following: one foot, one hand, blindness in one eye (having light perception only), one or more creative organs, both buttocks, organic aphoria (with constant inability to communicate by speech), deafness of both ears (having absence of air and bone conduction)—for each loss	70
--	----

(k)(2) Limit for veterans receiving payments under (a) to (j) above ... 2,152

(k)(3) Limit for veterans receiving benefits under (l) to (n) below ... 3,015

(l) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both feet, one foot and one hand, blindness in both eyes (5/200) visual acuity or less, permanently bedridden or so helpless as to require aid and attendance ... 2,152

(m) Anatomical loss or loss of use of both hands, or of both legs, at a level preventing natural knee action with prosthesis in place or of 1 arm and 1 leg at a level preventing natural knee or elbow action with prosthesis in place or blind in both eyes, either with light perception only or rendering veteran so helpless as to require aid and attendance ... 2,371

Percentage of disability or subsection under which payment is authorized:

- (n) Anatomical loss of both eyes or blindness with no light perception or loss of use of both arms at a level preventing natural elbow action with prosthesis in place or anatomical loss of both legs so near hip as to prevent use of prosthesis, or anatomical loss of 1 arm and 1 leg so near shoulder and hip to prevent use of prosthesis 2,696
- (o) Disability under conditions entitling veterans to two or more of the rates provided in (l) through (n), no condition being considered twice in the determination, or deafness rated at 60 percent or more (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with total blindness (5/200 visual acuity or less) or deafness rated at 40 percent or total deafness in one ear (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) in combination with blindness having light perception only or anatomical loss of both arms so near the shoulder as to prevent use of prosthesis 3,015
- (p)(1) If disabilities exceed requirements of any rates prescribed, Secretary of Veterans Affairs may allow next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no case may compensation exceed 3,015
- (p)(2) Blindness in both eyes (with 5/200 visual acuity or less) together with (a) bilateral deafness rated at 30 percent or more disabling (impairment of either or both ears service-connected) next higher rate is payable, or (b) service-connected total deafness of one ear or service-connected loss or loss of use of an extremity the next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed 3,015
- (p)(3) Blindness with only light perception or less with bilateral deafness (hearing impairment in either one or both ears is service-connected) rated at 10 or 20 percent disabling, the next intermediate rate is payable, but in no event may compensation exceed .. 3,015
- (p)(4) Anatomical loss or loss of use of three extremities, the next higher rate in paragraphs (l) to (n) but in no event in excess of 3,015
- (q) [This subsection repealed by Public Law 90-493.]
- (r)(1) If veteran entitled to compensation under (o) or to the maximum rate under (p); or at the rate between subsections (n) and (o) and under subsection (k), and is in need of regular aid and attendance, he shall receive a special allowance of the amount indicated at right for aid and attendance in addition to such rates 1,295
- (r)(2) If the veteran, in addition to need for regular aid and attendance is in need of a higher level of care, a special allowance of the amount indicated at right is payable in addition to (o) or (p) rate 1,928
- (s) Disability rated as total, plus additional disability independently ratable at 60 percent or over, or permanently housebound 1,935

(t) [This subsection repealed by Public Law 90-576.]

In addition to basic compensation rates and/or statutory awards to which the veteran may be entitled, dependency allowances are payable to veterans who are rated at not less than 30 percent disabled. The rates which follow are those payable to veterans while rated totally disabled. If the veteran is rated 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80 or 90 percent disabled, dependency allowances are payable in an amount bearing the same ratio to the amount specified below as the degree of disability bears to total disability. For example, a veteran who is 50 percent disabled receives 50 percent of the amounts which appear below.

If and while veteran is rated totally disabled and—

Has a spouse	\$103
Has a spouse and child	174
Has no spouse, 1 child	71
For each additional child	54
For each dependent parent	82
For each child age 18-22 attending school	160
Has a spouse in nursing home or severely disabled	191
Has disabled, dependent adult child	191

The following rates apply to surviving spouses of deceased veterans whose deaths occurred as the result of service-connected disabilities or while on active military duty before January 1, 1993. (Several of these rates have been superseded by the enactment of Public Law 102-568, which provides a minimum payment of \$750 per month).

Pay grade

E-1	634
E-2	664
E-3	672
E-4	714
E-5	732
E-6	749
E-7	785
E-8	829
E-9	866
W-1	803
W-2	835
W-3	860
W-4	911
O-1	803
O-2	829
O-3	866
O-4	930
O-5	1,035
O-6	1,168
O-7	1,282
O-8	1,383
O-9	1,483
O-10	1,627

¹ If the veteran served as Sergeant Major of the Army, Senior Enlisted Advisor of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$834.

² If the veteran served as Chairman or Vice-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps or Commandant of the Coast Guard, at the applicable time designated by section 402 of this title, the surviving spouse's rate shall be \$1,744.

When there is no surviving spouse receiving dependency and indemnity compensation, payment is made in equal shares to the children of the deceased veteran. These rates are increased as follows:

One child	\$319
Two children	480
Three children	506
Each additional child	117

I urge favorable consideration of the bill by the House.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Veterans' Compensation Rate Codification Act of 1993, H.R. 798. As explained by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. SLATTERY, this measure simply makes technical changes in title 38. It places in law the current rates of compensation for service-connected veterans, and DIC for their widows and children which were enacted last fall in separate cost-of-living legislation. I recommend passage of this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am honored to rise in support of H.R. 798, the Veteran's Compensation Rate Codification Act. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Mr. SLATTERY, for introducing this bill. I am pleased to note the outstanding work that is conducted by the Veterans' Affairs Committee under the strong leadership of its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and its ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Madam Speaker, the Veteran's Compensation Rate Codification Act makes a technical change to title 38 of the United States Code, which provides disability compensation to our Nation's veterans. This noncontroversial measure will complement Public Law 102-510, legislation that was passed during the 102d Congress.

This legislation provides a rate chart which will detail the amount of compensation due to a veteran in each category of disability and will reflect the cost-of-living allowance that had been approved according to Public Law 102-510. For the record, I would like to add that estimates done by the Congressional Budget Office have stated that H.R. 798 will not cause any additional cost increases, since the COLA had been previously authorized.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 798. It is a necessary measure that will aid our Nation's veterans and I urge my colleagues to approve this measure.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, for all the hard work he has done.

Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

We are very proud that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY] is

the new chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance. It has been a pleasure to work with him.

I would also like to thank the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for his support. This is a necessary bill, mainly a technical bill.

I urge the adoption of H.R. 798.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 798, the Veterans' Compensation Rate Codification Act of 1993. It is vital that we incorporate desperately needed cost-of-living increases in the compensation provided to our veterans who have so honorably served our Nation.

H.R. 798 codifies a 3-percent cost-of-living increase in veterans' compensation rates for service-connected disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC]. I am pleased to lend my support to this very modest way we can support our Nation's veterans. This provides us with a good starting ground from which Congress can take a serious, careful look at ways we can continue to improve veterans benefits and services. I would like to give particular thanks to Chairman MONTGOMERY and Representative JIM SLATTERY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension, and Insurance, for their diligent efforts on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, supporting benefits for our veterans is one important way we can carry out our national responsibility in compensating veterans for their courageous service to our country.

Mr. TEJEDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 798, a bill which recognizes—by specifying a 3-percent cost-of-living adjustment for veterans disability compensation—the important sacrifices made by our disabled veterans and veterans' survivors. I am proud to support this legislation and those deserving persons it will benefit. While this particular bill is only completing the work accomplished last Congress, the underlying principles are fundamental.

Compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and survivors of veterans who died of combat-related injuries is one of America's fundamental obligations. As Charles Jackson, president/CEO of the Non Commissioned Officers Association, recently testified,

Veterans benefits are not designed to enrich veterans, but to make them whole. Veterans benefits are designed to restore education and economic opportunities lost due to military service. They are designed to treat the physical and psychological maladies of service.

Mr. Speaker, we owe a tremendous debt to those disabled veterans who stood the long watches and sacrificed for our Nation's defense. We similarly owe an incredible debt to the survivors of veterans who endured the long separations from their loved ones imposed by military service. The 3-percent COLA enacted last year and the President's budget request for a COLA in fiscal year 1994 will help compensate these disabled veterans and survivors for their unflinching commitment and will halt the erosion of benefits by inflation.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to remember that, from 1985 to 1991, veterans com-

pensation benefits have risen on an annual rate of only 2.4 percent while other social entitlement programs grew at an annual rate of 9 to 15 percent over the same period. At the same time, our financial commitment to our veterans has, in relative terms, been cut in half. While VA benefits represented 5 cents of each tax dollar in 1975, today, that figure stands at 2.4 cents. We cannot forget the debt we owe to our veterans, and I will continue to fight for the protection of necessary veterans benefits.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 798 to reaffirm our commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 798, the Veterans' Compensation Rate Codification Act of 1993. This bill simply makes technical changes to title 38, placing into law the current rates of compensation for disabled veterans and the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation [DIC] for their widows and children.

As my colleague from Kansas, Mr. SLATTERY, has explained, we authorized these increases during the 102d Congress. However, due to our early adjournment, the rate increases were not codified into law. H.R. 798 amends provisions in title 38 to accurately reflect the new rates of compensation.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 798 in the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 798, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION ACT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1032) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improved and expedited procedures for resolving complaints of unlawful employment discrimination arising within the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1032

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act".

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION RESOLUTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 7 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 8—EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION

"Sec.

"801. Scope of chapter.

"802. Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution.

"803. Informal complaint resolution.

"804. Investigation of complaints.

"805. Final agency decision; hearings.

"806. Review of final agency decisions.

"807. Unlawful employment discrimination defined.

"§ 801. Scope of chapter

"(a) The procedures established in this chapter shall be implemented in a manner consistent with procedures applicable under regulations prescribed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

"(b) In the case of an employee of the Department who alleges that the employee has been subjected to unlawful employment discrimination (as defined in section 807 of this title), the allegation shall be considered under the procedures applicable to the Merit Systems Protection Board under title 5 (rather than under the procedures set forth in this chapter) if the action (or failure to act) of which the employee complains is an employment action or practice that is otherwise appealable to the Merit System Protection Board.

"(c) Nothing in this chapter supersedes—

"(1) the rights and remedies available to employees under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.), including the rights and remedies provided in section 177A of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1981a); or

"(2) any right or obligation of an employee to elect (in lieu of procedures under this chapter) to raise an allegation of unlawful employment discrimination under grievance procedures established under a collective bargaining agreement.

"§ 802. Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution

"(a)(1) There is in the Department an Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution (hereinafter in this chapter referred to as the "Office"), which shall be headed by a Director. The Director shall report only to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary.

"(2) Subject to the direction of the Secretary, the Director shall have sole responsibility within the Department for administering the procedures under this chapter for resolving complaints of unlawful employment discrimination arising within the Department.

"(3) In addition to the functions of the Director under paragraph (2), the Director shall perform such other functions as the Secretary may prescribe consistent with the functions of the Director under paragraph (2).

"(b) The Secretary shall employ within the Office administrative law judges appointed in accordance with section 3105 of title 5 for the purposes of this chapter and such other personnel as the Office may require. In appointing administrative law judges, the Secretary should consider the composition of the persons appointed, taken as a group, in terms of race, sex, and veterans status, compared with the composition of the total Department workforce in terms of race, sex, and veterans status.

"(c) The Secretary shall ensure that the Director is furnished sufficient resources to enable the Director to carry out the functions of the Office under this chapter in a timely manner.

"(d) The Secretary shall include in the documents submitted to Congress by the Secretary in support of the President's budget for each fiscal year—

"(1) detailed information on the budget for the Office;

"(2) the Secretary's opinion as to whether the resources (including the number of employees) proposed in the budget for that fiscal year are adequate to enable the Secretary to comply with statutory and regulatory deadlines for the administration of the procedures under this chapter and other provisions of law relating to the resolution of complaints of unlawful employment discrimination involving the Department; and

"(3) a report on the activities of the Office during the preceding fiscal year, including (A) a statement of the number and nature of complaints of unlawful employment discrimination received and the number and nature of complaints resolved, and the results of any appellate review, during the year, (B) a description of the timeliness of the resolution of complaints during the year, and (C) a statement of significant decisions and trends affecting the work of the Office.

"(e)(1) The Director shall prescribe—

"(A) standards of timeliness for the expeditious resolution of complaints of unlawful employment discrimination under this chapter;

"(B) the qualifications and training requirements for employees of the Office;

"(C) requirements for record-keeping pertaining to counseling and investigations by employees of the Office; and

"(D) standards for the conduct of investigations under section 804 of this title.

"(2) Regulations under paragraph (1) shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, except that, in the interest of the expeditious resolution of complaints, the Director may prescribe shorter time periods with respect to any deadline or administrative period that is applicable only to the time within which the Government may (or is required to) act.

"§ 803. Informal complaint resolution

"Employees of the Office shall counsel employees of the Department and applicants for employment with the Department, who allege that they have been subject to unlawful employment discrimination by an officer or employee of the Department. The Office shall seek to resolve such complaints in an expeditious and impartial manner through informal investigation and conciliation using procedures prescribed by the Director.

"§ 804. Investigation of complaints

"(a) If a complaint of unlawful employment discrimination is filed with the Department and the complaint is not resolved through the informal resolution process under section 803 of this title, the Director shall assign the complaint to an administrative law judge, who shall determine whether the complaint shall be accepted for investigation.

"(b)(1) The administrative law judge assigned to a complaint shall make such determination in accordance with regulations of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, except that if the administrative law judge determines that the complaint is without merit, the administrative law judge may determine that the complaint is not to be accepted for investigation.

"(2) A decision that a complaint is not to be accepted for investigation is a final agency decision of the matter.

"(c)(1) If the administrative law judge determines that the complaint is to be accept-

ed, the Director shall promptly provide for an investigation of the complaint, which shall be carried out by employees of the Office (or by contract personnel acquired by the Director). The employee (or contractor) conducting the investigation shall submit to the Director a complete written report of the results if the investigation.

"(2) If a portion of a complaint is accepted for investigation and a portion is not accepted, the individual filing the complaint or the Department may request the administrative law judge to direct the suspension of the investigation of the portion of the complaint accepted for investigation pending the results of any review of the decision not to accept the other portion.

"(3) The Director shall furnish a copy of the investigative report (including a copy of the investigative file) to the administrative law judge, the individual who filed the complaint, and the Secretary. The administrative law judge may direct that an additional investigation be made if the administrative law judge determines that an additional investigation is warranted.

"§ 805. Final agency decision; hearings

"(a) The final agency decision on a complaint of unlawful employment discrimination, in a case not resolved through informal procedures under section 803 of this title, shall be made by an administrative law judge.

"(b) The individual filing the complaint may request a hearing on the matter. Any such request shall be made in such time and manner as may be prescribed by the Director. The administrative law judge shall grant a request for a hearing unless, after giving appropriate notice and allowing an opportunity to respond to such notice, the administrative law judge determines that there is no genuine dispute as to a material fact.

"(c) If the administrative law judge grants a request of the individual filing the complaint for a hearing, the administrative law judge—

"(1) may conduct the hearing on the matter; or

"(2) may refer the matter for a hearing by a hearing examiner.

"(d) In any hearing under this section, the administrative law judge or hearing examiner presiding at the hearing shall have the authorities set forth in section 556(c) of title 5.

"§ 806. Review of final agency decisions

"(a) If the final agency decision in a case complaining of unlawful employment discrimination by an officer or employee of the Department is adverse to the individual filing the complaint, the individual may appeal the decision to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or may institute an action on the case in the appropriate United States district court, as provided by law.

"(b) If the final agency decision in such a case is adverse to the Department, the Secretary may appeal the decision to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Any such appeal shall be made within 30 days after the date of the receipt by the Secretary of the decision. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission may act on such an appeal in the same manner as in the case of an appeal by an individual against a final agency decision.

"§ 807. Unlawful employment discrimination defined

"For purposes of this chapter, the term 'unlawful employment discrimination' means any action, or failure to act, that is a violation of any of the following:

"(1) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

"(2) The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 621 et seq.).

"(3) Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206).

"(4) Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 791)."

"(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The tables of chapters at the beginning of title 38, United States Code, and at the beginning of part I of such title, are amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 7 the following new item:

"8. Employment Discrimination 801".

SEC. 3. TRANSITION.

Chapter 8 of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 2, shall apply with respect to complaints of unlawful employment discrimination that are filed after the end of the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act. Any complaint filed before the end of such period shall be resolved in accordance with the procedures in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR TITLE 38 EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end of subchapter V the following new section:

"§ 7465. Disclosures of violations of law, gross mismanagement, and certain other matters: protection of employees

"(a) The provision of section 2302(b)(8) of title 5 shall apply with respect to an employee, or applicant for employment, in a position covered by this chapter in the same manner as if that position were a 'covered position' within the meaning of section 2302(a)(2)(B) of title 5.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall apply for purposes of applying the provisions of subchapters II and III of chapter 12 of title 5 which relate to any authority to conduct investigations, or to seek or administer any corrective action, disciplinary action, or other remedy in connection with a prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b)(8) of such title."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7464 the following new item:

"7465. Disclosures of violations of law, gross mismanagement, and certain other matters: protection of employees."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), section 7465 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to personnel actions occurring before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but subject to any deadline for commencing any action for relief.

(2) Such section shall not affect any administrative proceeding pending on the date of the enactment of this Act, and order shall be issued in any such proceeding, and appeals shall be taken therefrom, as if such section had not been enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act, is an important first step in dealing with sexual harassment and other kinds of illegal employment discrimination in the Department of Veterans Affairs. The bill is cosponsored by almost all of the members of our committee and was ordered reported by a vote of 32-0.

This bill was introduced as a result of abuses uncovered at a hearing held last year by LANE EVANS and our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. That hearing clearly established conflicts of interest in the current process. Another hearing was held by the full committee on March 30 and confirmed the deficiencies in the current system. H.R. 1032 is designed to correct these deficiencies.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for conducting the first hearing and for his help in developing the bill now before the House.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] for his leadership and assistance.

Mr. EVANS will explain the bill more fully but, briefly, H.R. 1032 would:

First, establish an independent office in the Department of Veterans Affairs to handle all complaints of discrimination, including complaints of sexual harassment;

Second, assign a permanent staff of trained EEO counselors to the new Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution;

Third, assign a permanent staff of trained investigators to handle formal complaints; and

Fourth, assign independent and unbiased administrative law judges to, among other things, make final decisions on complaints, and allow a review of such decisions by the EEOC's Office of Federal Operations or by an appropriate Federal district court.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to explain this splendid bill.

□ 1310

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, last September, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which I am privileged to chair, conducted a hearing which examined sexual harassment in the VA workplace and VA's equal employment opportunity process.

I would like to thank both the distinguished gentlewoman from Indiana, JILL LONG, for requesting September's hearing and the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado, PAT SCHROEDER, for her assistance and continued interest in this important issue.

During September's hearing, a number of very courageous VA employees,

including victims of sexual harassment, testified before the subcommittee. The subcommittee learned about the problems they had experienced in the workplace and the flaws inherent in the EEO process. VA's EEO process not only failed to assist employees who had experienced employment discrimination, it worked against the victims while aiding the offenders.

Based in part on the record compiled by the subcommittee, H.R. 1032 was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, SONNY MONTGOMERY. This measure received the bipartisan support of the committee and was approved on April 1 by a unanimous vote. Accordingly, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, BOB STUMP, and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their support of this measure.

As reported, this measure provides needed statutory reform of the EEO procedures used in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act, amends title 38, United States Code, to provide improved and expedited procedures for resolving complaints of unlawful employment discrimination arising within the Department. The bill adds a new chapter, chapter 8 employment discrimination, in title 38 United States Code to carry out the purpose of this legislation.

In summary, this legislation establishes an Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution within VA which is headed by a Director, appointed by the Secretary, who reports only to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary.

Currently EEO Program responsibility is scattered throughout VA; there is no meaningful VA EEO Program accountability. Under the bill, as reported, both the responsibility and accountability for resolving formal and informal employment discrimination complaints is centralized in the newly created Office.

The bill requires this Office to provide counseling to employees and job applicants who allege that they have been subject to unlawful employment discrimination—by an officer or employee of the Department. The Office is also directed to informally investigate and impartially and promptly attempt to informally resolve complaints of unlawful employment discrimination.

If a complaint cannot be resolved informally, it could be investigated formally by the Office in accordance with regulations of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

A written report of the results of each formal investigation is required to be furnished to the Director, the complainant, the final agency decision-maker, and the Secretary.

A complainant may also request a hearing. When this happens, a hearing

will be conducted unless it is determined—by an administrative law judge—that there is no genuine issue in dispute.

Under this legislation, an administrative law judge employed by the Office will issue the final agency decision for formal complaints.

In appointing administrative law judges, the bill provides that the Secretary should consider the composition of those appointed, taken as a group, in terms of race, sex, and veteran status, compared with the composition of the total Department work force in terms of race, sex, and veteran status.

Complainants may appeal adverse final agency decisions to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission or to a U.S. district court. Similarly, a final agency decision adverse to VA may be appealed by VA to the EEOC.

Under this bill, VA is also required to provide the Congress information on agency employment discrimination complaints, their resolution, and related matters.

As reported, H.R. 1032 requires that procedures established by VA under this act are to be implemented in a manner consistent with procedures applicable under regulations prescribed by the EEOC.

The bill further provides that nothing in the act supersedes the rights and remedies available to employees under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Section 4 of the bill extends to VA employees appointed under the authority of title 38, all whistleblower protections which have been provided to other Federal employees.

Because of the many serious flaws in VA's current EEO process, we cannot know the full extent or cost of VA employment discrimination, including workplace sexual harassment. We do know, however, that employment discrimination can be enormously costly to both dedicated VA employees and the VA as an employer. In addition, unlawful employment discrimination can jeopardize and seriously impair the timely provision of quality benefits and services to our Nation's veterans and their dependents.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1032, a bipartisan bill which would provide for improved and expedited procedures for resolving complaints of unlawful employment discrimination at the Department of Veterans Affairs [VA].

In the past year, serious incidents involving sexual harassment in the workplace at VA hospitals have come to light. Some have involved supervisors and one involved a senior manager. Last September oversight hearings probed specific incidents and revealed a lack of employee confidence in the fairness and timeliness of VA's EEO sys-

tem, as well as fears of reprisal. Although these cases have arisen at only a few hospitals, they have served to identify systemic weaknesses in the VA's EEO Program.

Chairman MONTGOMERY saw the need for an overhaul of VA's EEO system. Consequently, he developed and introduced H.R. 1032 in full consultation with the minority. I commend his early leadership on this important issue. While this legislation only pertains to EEO at the VA, the new approach which Chairman MONTGOMERY has outlined in his remarks could well become the model for the entire Federal Government.

The VA has already begun an effort to combat sexual harassment. To his credit, VA Secretary Jesse Brown has made a fine start in this respect, but it surprised me that the administration is opposed to H.R. 1032. At a recent committee hearing on the bill, Secretary Brown's explanations of the administration's reasons for opposition struck me as unpersuasive, and they appeared to perplex members on both sides of the aisle. He said the bill was unnecessary, but it goes considerably beyond the administrative actions taken at the VA. He said the bill would treat VA employees differently than other Federal employees, but in fact all Federal departments and agencies have considerable latitude today under law and regulation in establishing their own internal EEO mechanisms. And in fact, the bill has some features similar to the existing Department of Defense EEO system. Hopefully, the administration will reconsider its opposition to this well thought out approach.

H.R. 1032 is modest in cost at \$3 million in fiscal year 1994 and at \$4 million in the outyears. The funds would be drawn from existing funding for VA's general operating expenses. While normally the committee avoids placing new mandates on the VA without providing additional funding, these EEO problems must be addressed as soon as possible and we should not wait until new funding can be found.

Madam Speaker, the VA does good work for veterans and is a good place to work. If enacted, H.R. 1032 would help to make the VA an even better place to work. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act. I would like to commend the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], for introducing this fine legislation. I would also like to commend

the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], and the ranking subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of H.R. 1032, legislation which establishes the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution, within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This independent Office will be charged with investigating and resolving complaints of employment discrimination, including accusations of sexual harassment. I believe this worthwhile legislation is a significant attempt to address a serious issue that challenges our Nation's workplace.

While the VA has taken appropriate steps to confront employment discrimination, more needs to be done. And, I believe that the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution will do just that. Staffed with trained counselors and investigators, the Office will be able to provide prompt resolution and adjudication for each unique case. Specific provisions of H.R. 1032 include: Providing counseling to the victims of discrimination; requiring the appropriate investigation of all complaints. The Office will also be required to provide the complainant and the Secretary of the VA with a copy of the conclusions and the final decision of the investigation; and, will permit complainants the opportunity to request a hearing before an administrative law judge.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the enactment of this legislation will cost \$3 million in fiscal year 1994 and \$4 million in each of fiscal years 1996-98. Since the funding for the Office will come from the Department's general operating expenses account, it will not affect direct spending.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act. And, I commend the fine work of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in confronting the challenges that face our Nation's veterans.

□ 1320

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Ms. LONG], a member of our committee.

Ms. LONG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act. Last September, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations conducted a hearing which examined the issue of sexual harassment in the DVA workplace. In some of the most powerful testimony which I have ever heard, a number of DVA employees graphically depicted a pattern of sexual harassment and abuse which they were forced

to endure. It became apparent to everyone who heard this moving testimony that the DVA had a problem which needed to be addressed. I believe that H.R. 1032, introduced by Chairman MONTGOMERY, represents a constructive effort to confront this serious problem.

Department of Veterans Affairs Secretary Jesse Brown, to his credit, forcefully addressed the problem of sexual harassment and discrimination in the DVA workplace from the moment he assumed his post. In reviewing the entire Equal Employment Opportunity Program at the Department, Secretary Brown has taken important steps to decentralize the processing of discrimination complaints and establish a requirement for a higher level review of all sexual harassment complaints. While I do not doubt Secretary Brown's commitment to eliminating sexual harassment and employment discrimination in the DVA workplace, I believe that the changes outlined in H.R. 1032 will only compliment Secretary Brown's initiatives.

H.R. 1032 would establish an independent office in the DVA to handle all complaints of discrimination, including complaints of sexual harassment. This legislation would also assign a permanent staff of trained equal employment opportunity counselors and investigators to the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution to assist in the resolution of formal and informal discrimination complaints brought against the DVA. Third, H.R. 1032 would assign independent and unbiased administrative law judges to determine whether a complaint should be investigated, review the adequacy of investigations, conduct hearings, and make final decisions on complaints.

I have no illusions that the steps taken in this bill will entirely eliminate sexual harassment and employment discrimination in the DVA workplace. However, I am confident that without addressing this issue with tough-minded and serious legislation, these unacceptable attitudes will never change.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act.

H.R. 1032 reflects the belated recognition by society at large of the corrosive effects of sexual harassment on the victim. Fortunately, H.R. 1032 also demonstrates the commitment of the House, and especially the Veterans' Affairs Committee, to take decisive action to eradicate this abusive behavior and its demoralizing consequences

within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

As our committee examined the record of sexual harassment and employment discrimination in the VA, it became painfully clear that the VA's settlement procedures are inadequate and in need of a decisive legislative fix.

H.R. 1032 would: Create an independent office—Office of Employment Discrimination Complaints Resolution [OEDCR] in the VA to manage all employment discrimination and sexual harassment complaints; establish a specially trained staff of dedicated counselors to help resolve informal complaints; assign permanent investigators to OEDCR who will prepare reports on formal discrimination cases; appoint impartial administrative law judges who will conduct hearings and pass judgment on complaints; and provide for case review by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC] or Federal court.

Madam Speaker, I was deeply moved by the testimony of Donna Grabarczyk, a full-time health employee at Lyons Medical Center in New Jersey who appeared before the Veterans' Committee last September.

Ms. Grabarczyk testified that she was sexually harassed both physically and verbally by the chief of fiscal services, C.W. Lewis. The abuse, she said, led to a "feeling of revulsion, violation, and helplessness." She said, "neither my immediate supervisor, Mr. Metaxas, nor the next level of supervision, Mr. Kidd, expressed any insight or concern about me." She was told that Mr. Lewis could not be fired even though other women testified that they too were harassed by this man. Her testimony is a disturbing insight into a flawed process that begs correction.

Mr. Joe Spencer Norris, the most recent investigator, advised me that I should just accept the fact that I was the scapegoat, "that's the system" and I should "give it up."

I can't believe that Mr. Norris's advice is in the best interest of the women throughout the VA who have been victims of sexual harassment. The VA's transfer of habitual harassers from station to station promotes their aberrant behavior. It also provides the harasser an opportunity to continue illegal actions in a new climate among unsuspecting women. Stringent remedies are needed to modify this behavior. Rewarding harassers with disability retirements instead of removal sends out the message of a VA-wide practice of condoning this behavior.

Adding injury to injury, both Ms. Grabarczyk and her coworker who helped collaborate her allegations say they were further victimized by retaliations and reprisals.

In testimony describing those reprisals, Donna Grabarczyk outlined the most basic and compelling justification for this legislation and in particular the witness protection provisions which we added to this measure in committee.

Relating the reprisals I have received over the past two years would take far more space than I am allowed in this statement. They include: denial of leave requests and education, exclusion from meetings I had previously attended, reduction in duties, change in title and position description, lowering of performance evaluations, restrictions on how I performed my duties, detailing to Nursing Service, placement of newspaper ads for my job, [and] moving my office out of the Director's suite into a basement with only a desk, phone, and broken chair. These are just some of the actions that have been taken to subtly and systematically destroy my career.

Madam Speaker, I coauthored an amendment with Mr. EVANS at the full committee to ensure that VA employees are protected from retaliation by extension of the authority of title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which defines reprisals as an unlawful employment practice.

Our amendment declared that nothing in H.R. 1032 supersedes the rights and remedies available to employees under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Section 2000e-3 offers protection for those who "made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding or hearing * * *."

Protection against reprisals was particularly necessary given the striking testimony of Mary Cavanaugh, a witness for Donna Grabarczyk at Lyons. She gave this chilling summation of her experience:

I believe I was reassigned as an act of retaliation for the testimony I gave in an EEO investigation concerning the sexual harassment of my friend and coworker, Donna Grabarczyk * * *. I was told categorically that I was not to participate in any of my previous functions, and I was taken off all hospital functions. I was also informed I would not be attending a training conference I had already been scheduled to attend * * *. To me, the reassignment to Nursing was nothing but pure revenge for any testifying on behalf of Donna Grabarczyk.

Madam Speaker, concrete protection against reprisals is absolutely necessary to the sound operation of any dispute resolution procedure. I believe my amendment improved this bill by enhancing the confidence of those VA employees who may someday need the services provided by H.R. 1032. I am pleased that the amendment was unanimously endorsed by the committee.

I urge the House to approve H.R. 1032 without delay and to take this bold step toward rooting out sexual harassment in the Federal Government.

Madam Speaker, I do hope the Veterans' Administration, which has embarked upon some very necessary internal reforms, will reverse itself with regard to this specific legislation. Just so the membership knows very clearly, the administration is on record as opposed to this legislation.

I am persuaded, however, that as it passes today and as it passes overwhelmingly over on the Senate side, they will reconsider and the President will sign this bill.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who is a member of our committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1032, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment and Discrimination Act of 1993.

First, I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], for the hard and diligent work they have done to get to the root cause of this important and very disturbing issue.

Madam Speaker, the American people have been outraged by the recent sexual-harassment cases uncovered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and rightfully so. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have read and heard the painful and compelling accounts of the many women and many men who are employees who have been victimized by sexual harassment.

The testimony that we have heard before our committee has been some of the most compelling and, indeed, I think heartfelt and also harmful that we have ever heard before our committee. Not a single Federal employee or any employee, for that matter, should have to go through this terrible discrimination in the workplace.

Employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs provide an invaluable service to the veterans who have so honorably served this country, and each and every person on the VA staff is well deserving of the dignity that they have earned in the workplace.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown for the leadership he has shown in resolving sexual harassment within the VA. He has taken quick steps to address the problem in announcing a new policy of zero tolerance of sexual harassment and requiring that all VA employees attend 4 hours of sexual harassment lectures.

H.R. 1032 goes a step further by making this a formal VA policy enacting into law a badly needed procedure for improving and expediting employment discrimination claims which arise within the Department of Veterans Affairs by establishing an independent Office of Employment Discrimination

Complaints Resolution in the VA. The office is to be headed by a director who reports only to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Through this independent office, VA employees and applicants for employment at the VA can seek fair, impartial resolution of employment distribution complaints.

Madam Speaker, sexual harassment cannot be tolerated anywhere, especially within our own Federal Government. Recent reports of the Tailhook incident in conjunction with those unveiled by the Department of Veterans Affairs are disturbing and unsettling, to say the least. These incidents only underscore the fact that sexual harassment is a serious, pervasive problem.

The Federal Government must set an example. We are taking a step in the right direction through the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act, and I urge my colleagues to set the record straight for our Federal employees who provide such valuable services to our veterans by supporting this bill.

Again, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], for their leadership and look forward to continuing to work with them.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], another member of our committee.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, the House of Representatives will vote today on H.R. 1032, legislation introduced by my distinguished colleague and esteemed chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi—legislation to establish an independent office in the Department of Veterans Affairs to handle all complaints of discrimination, including complaints of sexual harassment. The efforts to pass this legislation are bipartisan.

I am most appreciative of the steps being taken by our new Secretary Jesse Brown toward his goal of totally eliminating discrimination and sexual harassment in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This legislation will assist the Department in expediting complaints of unlawful employment discrimination and sexual harassment—by assigning a permanent staff of formally trained counselors, investigators, and unbiased administrative law judges to ferret out and deal with any problem situations that do occur. In addition, H.R. 1032 will remedy conflicts of interest that occur in the current process being used to resolve these complaints.

Testimony last year in a public hearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] established a need for

this fundamental reform. The subcommittee heard that " * * * in too many cases, a woman who complains of sexual harassment finds herself presenting a complaint to the * * * officer who is the very harasser of which she has complained."

Further, a review conducted by the VA Office of Inspector General reported that 25 percent of randomly selected employees were reluctant to file a complaint for fear of reprisal.

Yes, H.R. 1032 is needed. Employment discrimination can be very costly to the employee and employer. Employee victims of discrimination are likely to have higher rates of absenteeism, lower worker productivity, and increased turnover rates. Conscientious and dedicated employees who are victims of sexual harassment can become fearful and, in some cases, unable to work at all. The existence of any discrimination and harassment in the Department of Veterans Affairs reduces its effectiveness in accomplishing its mission of service to the Nation's veterans.

By raising to consciousness the zero-tolerance expectation of Secretary Brown and by putting into place a strong and effective system to deal with any violations of that expectation, the Department of Veterans Affairs could well become a model for the rest of our governmental departments in this regard.

I join with my colleagues of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in asking for the support of the House of Representatives in the swift passage of this legislation.

□ 1330

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to speak on behalf of legislation that makes sense and makes a difference.

In rising today in support of H.R. 1032, I am able to do just that.

As a newcomer to Washington, I am pleased to see that we can reinvent government. I am proud to see that Congress—when it chooses—can bring change to a country that desperately needs and desires change.

I would like to first thank and commend those who have enabled us to bring this important bill to the floor today: The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, who focused the attention and energy of the members of our committee on this work. My thanks go to him and to my colleague and friend from Illinois, LANE EVANS, who brought this urgent subject to light through hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on

Oversight and Investigations—a panel on which I am pleased to serve in this Congress under his direction.

It is through their leadership that this bill enjoys not simply approval by our committee, but indeed bipartisan support.

With H.R. 1032, we have the unique opportunity to bring a Department of the Government into the present and prepare it for the future, after a long period where the status quo kept us from even imagining that such reform could be signed into law. We have the chance to place the VA at the forefront of an important issue and, therefore, to make the Department of Veterans Affairs a role-model for the Government and the Nation.

Perhaps there is a need for such reform throughout the Government as a whole. But for now, I am aware of no other committee—besides the Veterans' Committee—which can boast of such results on this crucial issue. So, for those who hope to give wider attention to this concern, let us begin here.

Let us remember—H.R. 1032 sends an important message. But, it does more than that, it brings about real change.

Whenever a new program is proposed, whenever change comes about, one inevitable question is the cost.

Yes, it will cost money to develop a program that will insure that employees' complaints receive the attention that they deserve. Fortunately, it is a small cost.

On the other hand, it is my belief and it is fact, that if nothing is done, it would be far more costly—because the VA will be forced to replace experienced, knowledgeable, dedicated employees who leave the Department if their complaints go unanswered and unresolved.

In fact, I would refer my colleagues to a recent survey of Fortune 500 companies. The survey found that sexual harassment costs our largest companies over \$6 million per year in absenteeism, lower productivity, and employee turnover.

But, when measuring costs, let us not stop there. Let us always remember that the ultimate cost is the impact that such problems bring to bear on the quality of care that our veterans receive. Our veterans have earned the right to expect the best services that we give them. So why not enact legislation that improves the care that they deserve? Voting for H.R. 1032 will accomplish that.

And, if we should worry about any other kind of cost, let us worry about this one: The price that all Americans pay when any one of us feels that we count for less than any other person. That is the true and terrible cost of discrimination. And it is something—with the help of H.R. 1032—that we may be taking steps to finally eliminate.

As our President has reminded us: Our challenges are great. We need ev-

everyone's help. We cannot afford to leave out anyone who has the vision and energy to help us succeed.

Madam Speaker, I chose to become a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with the hope that I could help honor the brave men and women who have honored all Americans with their courage.

I wish to honor those who returned home after service, and those who never returned.

In passing H.R. 1032, I believe that we all give honor to those brave men and women. Because this bill reminds us why they fought and served—because they believed in the idea of America: a country where individuals are valued based on their character, their work, and their thoughts, not on their gender, or race, or nationality.

They defended America because it is a free land—where people are free to become what they want—not what someone else says they are. Where a person is limited only by the scope of his or her goals, and not by the constraints that others impose through prejudice.

That is why they served us.

That is why I serve them today.

And that is why passage of H.R. 1032 will serve us all.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCloskey], a former member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and who now chairs a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. McCloskey. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend Mr. MONTGOMERY and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their swift action to address egregious problems at the Department of Veterans Affairs. Their efforts on behalf of the employees of the Veterans' Administration are outstanding. The reports of sexual harassment at Veterans hospitals are alarming and disturbing. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, it is my intention to address these problems throughout the Federal work force.

It is extremely important that all Federal employees receive the same rights and fair treatment regardless of which Agency employs them and I would hope that all in Congress agree. Piecemeal reform is not good public policy. The Subcommittee on Civil Service has legislation pending that would reform the Federal equal employment opportunity process. In the 102d Congress, the Federal Employee Fairness Act, H.R. 3613 was the subject of numerous hearings and was ultimately reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Federal EEO reform is of the highest priority and I want to stress my commitment to working to correct problems in the system. I would like to as-

sure you that I plan to conduct hearings on legislation to reform the Federal EEO process shortly, and I fully intend to address the needs of Veterans' employees. In all likelihood, any legislation that will be reported from my subcommittee will supersede the provisions of H.R. 1032. I welcome the veterans' committee's input into omnibus Federal EEO reform legislation.

Again, I commend Mr. MONTGOMERY and the Veterans' Committee for their hard work on this issue. It is a first step toward Federal EEO reform. I appreciate their thoughtful consideration of my concerns and work on behalf of Federal employees, and I look forward to working together.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his remarks, and I thank the other Members who have spoken on this legislation also.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Clyburn], who is also a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

I am pleased to stand in support of H.R. 1032 and wish to thank Chairman MONTGOMERY, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. STUMP for the hard work they have put forth on this legislation.

It is probably known to most Members of this body that I spent the last 18 years of my life implementing rules and regulations in the State of South Carolina having to do with sexual harassment and other ancillary issues. I believe that this legislation offers the Department of Veterans Affairs a tremendous opportunity to be a guiding light in the Federal service, in trying to remedy a problem that all of us wish we did not have.

I am pleased that we are doing this, and I hope that we can look forward to a future where all employees in the Federal sector will look to the Veterans' Administration with thanks for its guidance in dealing with these issues.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, as a result of an important hearing conducted last September by our Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which examined sexual harassment in the VA workplace, the Veterans' Affairs Committee learned that real and potential conflicts of interest exist at every level of the process used today by VA to resolve complaints of unlawful employment discrimination.

The reforms provided in the legislation which is being considered today are intended to eliminate these conflicts-of-interest and provide fairness, objectivity and impartiality in the procedures used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to resolve employment discrimination complaints. Since the

procedures used by other Federal agencies are not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the legislation reported by our committee addresses only the procedures used by VA to resolve employment discrimination complaints.

Under current procedures, a VA employee or an applicant for VA employment who believes she or he has been subject to unlawful employment discrimination is required to seek out and consult with a VA equal employment opportunity counselor within prescribed time limits prior to filing a formal complaint of discrimination. After being contacted, the VA equal employment opportunity counselor is expected to inquire into the facts of the matter and attempt to foster an informal resolution of the perceived discrimination. In theory, through this process, acts of alleged employment discrimination may be brought for the first time to the attention of local facility managers who can aid in the informal resolution of alleged incidents of employment discrimination, including sexual harassment.

In VA, equal employment opportunity counselors are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the local facility director, who also serves as the principal equal employment opportunity officer of the facility. In VA the responsibilities associated with being an equal employment opportunity counselor are collateral duties; they are in addition to the primary job responsibilities of the employee/counselor who is ordinarily a full-time VA employee.

Unfortunately, according to the testimony presented to the Committee by VA employees who were victims of sexual harassment in the VA workplace and information subsequently provided by the VA Office of Inspector General, at some facilities VA equal employment opportunity counselors—who are the initial point of contact for the persons who have experienced unlawful employment discrimination—have not been available to provide necessary counseling to discrimination victims, have not attempted to informally resolve alleged acts of discrimination, have discouraged employees from making a formal complaint of employment discrimination, and have not received adequate training in equal employment opportunity counseling.

By virtue of being appointed by and serving at the pleasure of local management, counselors are perceived by some employees as lacking objectivity, impartiality and needed independence. As a result of this perception and employee fear of subtle or pronounced retaliation or reprisal by management if an informal or formal employee who may have experienced employment discrimination, including sexual harassment, have failed to contact an EEO counselor and report the alleged dis-

crimination. Unfortunately, because employees have been scared silent in some cases and have taken no action to stop or prevent the unlawful employment discrimination which they experienced, other VA employees have subsequently been sexually harassed by the same offender.

While VA officials note that relatively few formal complaints of sexual harassment are actually made by employees, testimony given before the Veterans' Affairs Committee strongly suggests a serious problem which may be substantially underreported and underrecorded. In fact, VA today does not systematically maintain information on informal complaints of sexual harassment and recordkeeping on informal complaints is haphazard at best.

When a complaint of unlawful employment discrimination cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant, a formal complaint may be made to the Department. Again, in theory, formal complaints are expected to be rigorously and fairly investigated and the facts of the matter determined. But like VA EEO counselors, VA equal employment opportunity investigators, according to information presented to the Committee, have not received adequate training in the conduct of equal employment opportunity investigations, may not have acted with independence, objectivity and impartiality and may have discouraged complainants from continuing to pursue resolution of alleged employment discrimination.

Sexual harassment can be extremely costly to both the employee victim and the employer. Sexual harassment creates a hostile work environment and results in increased absenteeism, lower productivity and higher employee turnover. As a direct result of sexual harassment, conscientious, highly skilled, committed and capable employees can become fearful of the workplace and unable to perform their customary duties, and in some cases, may become unable to work at all.

Madam Speaker, in hearings on this legislation, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs advised us of the many things he is doing to combat illegal harassment and discrimination. Under his leadership, the agency is continuing a comprehensive program of employee education and awareness so that all VA employees are fully informed of the Department's standards of conduct, the unacceptability of behavior which constitutes sexual harassment and the consequences of this type of discrimination. In addition, internal reforms have been directed to make the complaints process more professional. But these changes, as welcome as they are, do not dispel the long-held belief of employees that voicing complaints will only lead to reprisal and retaliation.

All VA employees must be made aware of the opportunity to report and

seek resolution of perceived unlawful employment discrimination. Only when employees are made fully aware of the opportunity for recourse and have confidence that fair, objective and impartial resolution is available to them, will they make full use of these procedures.

Sexual harassment must not be tolerated in the VA or any other department or agency of the Federal Government. With 260,000 employees, 57 percent of whom are women, VA is the Federal Government's second largest employer. It should be a model for other agencies and departments to emulate.

The goal of this legislation is to restore employee confidence in the integrity of the process used in VA to resolve complaints of unlawful employment discrimination. In my opinion, this is the needed medicine to effectively treat what appears to be a serious illness in the American workplace.

Madam Speaker, some have expressed concern that the bill only applies to the VA, and that there should be a national policy that applies to all departments and agencies. I would like to see a uniform national policy as well. But no one knows when the administration will propose such a policy or when this policy might become law.

We should not wait for a national policy to be implemented when we know something should be done now to make the process more fair for people who experience sexual harassment or other unlawful employment discrimination in the VA. As the sponsor of the bill, my position is, and I believe other members of the committee share this view, that we should proceed with this bill until a national policy is established. H.R. 1032 is supported by the Nurses Organization of Veterans Affairs, the DAV and the Vietnam Veterans of America. In addition, we have recently been advised that Federally Employed Women, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the National Treasury Employees Union, and the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law are in favor of this measure.

Finally, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. FORD, and the ranking minority member, Mr. GOODLING, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. BROOKS, and the ranking minority member, Mr. FISH, for their cooperation in assuring that the House could consider this measure in a timely manner.

I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. CLAY, and the ranking minority member, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, for their cooperation on this measure.

I think H.R. 1032 will strengthen the current process and I urge adoption of the bill.

□ 1340

Madam Speaker, we also have the blue sheets that fully explain this legislation. It is on the desk here. They will be here for the rest of the afternoon.

I think we have a wonderful bill here. This is a great first step, and I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, once more I would like to thank the chairman for his work, and that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN], as well as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on my side of the aisle.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, the Department of Veterans Affairs Employment Discrimination Act, introduced by Chairman SONNY MONTGOMERY, is commendably directed at the well-documented problem of sexual discrimination at Veterans hospitals across the Nation. H.R. 1032, however, is only a first step. Discrimination in the Federal workplace exists not only at the Department of Veterans Affairs, but throughout the Federal Government and at all levels. The evidence shows that sexual harassment is especially widespread. However, discrimination in the Federal workplace affects not only female employees, but also reaches to race, religion, and ethnicity. Therefore, I am currently working closely with Congressman MATTHEW MARTINEZ on the Federal Employees Fairness Act, already introduced in the Senate by Senator JOHN GLENN. The Federal Employees Fairness Act will provide a Government-wide approach to addressing the problem of employment discrimination in the Federal workplace, including sexual harassment at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and it will also address all the other forms of employment discrimination.

As a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I know well that H.R. 1032 strikes a much needed blow against employment discrimination. I know that this bill is intended only as a beginning. May I therefore also encourage all of this bill's supporters to join Congressman MARTINEZ and me in sponsoring the Federal Employees Fairness Act, which will address the problem of employment discrimination in the Federal workplace in a comprehensive fashion.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, first, let me take a moment to commend Chairman MONTGOMERY for his diligent work on this legislation. Harassment in the workplace is a serious matter which needs to be addressed.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is the second largest Federal agency with approximately 260,000 employees. Additionally, the VA's work force includes a large number of women and minorities. Given this diversity, it is important that all VA employees are treated fairly and with sensitivity in the workplace.

During the 102d Congress, the Veterans' Affairs Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, on which I served as the ranking minority member, held a hearing on sexual harassment charges at the VA. Our hearing revealed among other things that the process in place at the VA for investigating sexual harassment complaints was seriously flawed.

Sexual harassment is a very serious matter. As we move toward greater equity in the work-

place and in society, sexual harassment must be confronted and conquered. Everyone has the right to live and go to work without the fear of sexual harassment.

We owe female veterans and all female VA employees the assurance that we will not tolerate sexual harassment at any level and we will do everything within our power to help create an atmosphere where human beings are respected for their work and contributions to our system. We will tolerate nothing less.

As Members of Congress with oversight authority over VA programs, we must ensure that all discrimination and sexual harassment complaints filed with the VA are handled in an appropriate and expeditious manner.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1032.

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SCHROEDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1032, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT UNDER IEEPA COVERING 6-MONTH PERIOD FROM OCTOBER 1, 1992, TO MARCH 31, 1993—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-80)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On September 30, 1990, in Executive Order No. 12730, President Bush declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, the President continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, and Executive Order No. 12131 of May 4, 1979, as

amended by Executive Order No. 12551 of February 21, 1986.

2. President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12730 pursuant to the authority vested in him as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. At that time, the President also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the NEA requires that the President, within 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from October 1, 1992, to March 31, 1993, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12730, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12730 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since the last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

—United States Government experts have continued their efforts to implement and strengthen export control systems, including pre-license inspections and post-shipment verifications, in the nations of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union—notably Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Russia, the Slovak Republic, and Ukraine, as they continue their progress towards democracy and market economies. We anticipate that these developments will facilitate enhanced trade in high-technology items and other commodities in the region, while helping to prevent unauthorized shipments or uses of such items. A key element of these efforts continues to be the prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and corresponding technology.

—Working diligently with our Coordinating Committee (COCOM) partners to expand export control cooperation with the newly developing democracies of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union and to streamline multilateral na-

tional security controls, we are pleased to report the following important developments:

- In their November 1992 High-Level Meeting, the COCOM partners took action to significantly liberalize export controls on certain telecommunications exports to the newly independent states (NIS) of the former Soviet Union and other Central European nations, which should facilitate rapid and reliable telecommunications between these nations and the West, as well as modern, cost-effective domestic telecommunications systems. This action was soon thereafter reflected in corresponding amendments to the Export Administration Regulation. (57 F.R. 61259, December 24, 1992.)
- Also in November, at the first High-Level "COCOM Cooperation Forum" (CCF) Meeting, which included the 17 members of COCOM, most of the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union (NIS), and other Central European nations, the United States announced an \$11 million technical assistance package to assist in the elimination of nuclear arms, enhanced nonproliferation efforts, and export control development. The United States, in cooperation with the CCF, hopes to engage these nations in further establishing controls for trade in sensitive goods and technologies, and to provide an impetus for wider access by those countries to controlled items.
- In the first 2 months of 1993, as a result of Bulgarian and Romanian commitments to undertake the establishment of effective export control systems, COCOM agreed to provide favorable consideration treatment for exports of strategic items to those countries. The Commerce Department is amending its regulations to reflect this development.
- We are also continuing our efforts to address the threat to the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States posed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems. As such, we continue to work with our major trading partners to strengthen export controls over goods, technology, and other forms of assistance that can contribute to the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missile systems;
- As of December 1992, the Australia Group (AG), a consortium of nations that seeks to prevent the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons (CBW), increased its membership to 24, with the admission of Iceland and Sweden in 1991 and Argentina and Hungary in 1992. In addition, the delegates agreed to increase from 50 to 54 the number

- of precursor chemicals subject to control and to adopt a common list of controlled biological items. The Commerce Department published a rule implementing these measures. (57 F.R. 60122, December 18, 1992.) As of December 1992, the delegates also agreed to a refined common control list of dual-use biological equipment. The Commerce Department is in the process of publishing a rule reflecting the changes to conform the U.S. list to the AG list.
- The United States was also a key participant in the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland. On September 3, 1992, the Conference on Disarmament, which drafted the CWC, forwarded to the United Nations General Assembly a draft CWC, which includes a prohibition on the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, use, or transfer of chemical weapons, as well as provides for destruction of chemical weapons production facilities and stockpiles. The Convention opened for signing in January of this year. The United States strongly supports these provisions and is working to implement them in harmony with our laws.
 - In December 1992, the 27-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), in which the United States participates, continued its discussions on nuclear-related dual-use controls. The NSG list is similar to the nuclear referral list currently administered by the Department of Commerce. The Department is working to publish a rule to conform the U.S. list with the NSG list. Also in December 1992, the NSG members agreed to procedures intended to standardize and improve the exchange of information among members.
 - At the March plenary session in Canberra, the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) members welcomed Iceland as the newest partner, bringing the total membership to 23 nations. Argentina and Hungary were also accepted as members, subject to final arrangements agreed to by the MTCR partners. A licensing and enforcement officers conference will be held in June 1993 to provide an information exchange forum for all partners on implementation of the new extended Guidelines, which now cover missiles capable of delivering all weapons of mass destruction. Previously, the regime covered only missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. The future of the MTCR is likely to be a main agenda item for the next plenary session to be held in November 1993.
 - In the area of supercomputers, in 1991 the United States established a

supercomputer safeguard regime with Japan. Since that time both countries have negotiated with European suppliers to expand this regime. Issues discussed at the March 1993 London meeting include the development of a common licensing policy and security safeguards.

- Finally, we continue to enforce export controls vigorously. The export control provisions of the Export Administration Regulations are enforced jointly by the Commerce Department's Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. Both of these agencies investigate allegations and, where appropriate, refer them for criminal prosecution by the Justice Department. Additionally, the Commerce Department has continued its practice of imposing significant administrative sanctions for violations, including civil penalties and denial of export privileges.
- Commerce's Office of Export Enforcement (OEE) has continued its vital preventive programs such as pre-license checks and post-shipment verifications, export license review, and on-site verification visits by teams of enforcement officers in many countries. The OEE has also continued its outreach to the business community to assist exporters with their compliance programs and to solicit their help in OEE's enforcement effort. The OEE further continued its well-received Business Executive Enforcement Team (BEET) to enhance interaction between the regulators and the regulated.
- During this 6-month reporting period, OEE has continued its new program—the Strategic and Non-proliferation Enforcement Program (SNEP)—which targets critical enforcement resources on exports to countries of concern in the Middle East and elsewhere.
- Two particularly important enforcement efforts during the past 6 months in which OEE was involved resulted in the arrest and indictment of several individuals, including several foreign nationals. In one case, OEE special agents arrested an Iranian national, Reza Zandian, and an American citizen, Charles Regar, on charges that they conspired and attempted to export a computer to Iran without the required validated license. The computer, valued in excess of \$2 million, was seized by the Commerce Department. The Department of Justice will seek forfeiture of the computer to the United States. In another case, a British citizen doing business in South Africa, David Brownhill, was arrested and charged with attempting to export polygraph and thermal imaging system equipment to South Af-

rica without authorization. Both of these cases are currently pending trial.

- In the last 6 months, the Commerce Department has also continued to enforce the antiboycott law vigorously. The Office of Antiboycott Compliance (OAC) maintains 30 full-time staff positions, and OAC has doubled the level of civil penalties it seeks to impose within the statutory \$10,000 per violation maximum. The total dollar amount of civil penalties imposed in fiscal year 1992 approaches \$2,109,000, the second largest amount in the history of the program. This amount includes a civil penalty of \$444,000 imposed in the first case alleging both antiboycott and export control violations.

—One particularly significant antiboycott compliance case was recently concluded by an order of February 11, 1993. Under that order, William Hardimon was assessed a civil penalty of \$54,000, and his export privileges were denied for 6 months. Hardimon allegedly refused to do business with another person in order to comply with an illegal Saudi Arabian requirement, complied with an illegal Kuwaiti boycott request, and failed to report the receipt of the boycott requests.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 1, 1992, to March 31, 1993, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be \$17,897,000, most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel, and overhead expenses.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

The WHITE HOUSE, April 27, 1993.

BIPARTISAN HERITAGE OF EXPEDITED RESCISSION LEGISLATION

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, I am surprised and truly disheartened by the partisan nature of the recent debate over expedited rescission legislation because this issue has a long history of bipartisan support. I am baffled by Members on the other side of the aisle who for years have actively promoted legislation weaker than our current H.R. 1578 but now are opposing this more fiscally responsible and politically feasible bill.

Starting in 1985 with Senator Dan Quayle, continuing with a Dick Armey

amendment in 1987, and followed by the Army-Johnson Current Level Rescission Act, Republicans have been involved from the earliest days in expedited rescission legislation requiring a majority vote in Congress to override the rescissions. In 1989, a bipartisan group including DICK ARMEY, Tom Carper, TIM JOHNSON, Lynn Martin, Bill Frenzel, and DAN GLICKMAN came together in search of a constructive approach with improved odds for enactment. After input from GERALD SOLOMON, HARRIS FAWELL, and others, that bill passed the House late last year with nearly unanimous support from Republicans.

After the Senate's failure to act, this year we in the House again made changes in the bill to address concerns of Members on both sides of the aisle. Any objective observer would conclude that these refinements have strengthened the bill.

Some claim that expedited rescission is a partisan plot by Democrats to weaken and steal the issue of line-item veto from Republicans. An honest look at history proves that this initiative has always relied on bipartisan support for its success and only this year has either side attempted to play games with this far-too-rare opportunity to enact real change.

I submit for the RECORD a more complete history of expedited rescission legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give the American people a reason to feel good about their Government by refusing to engage in petty partisanship and by passing expedited rescission legislation.

SELECTED QUOTES ON EXPEDITED RESCISSION

Senator Dan Quayle in an opinion editorial in the Wall Street Journal on January 29, 1985, regarding expedited rescission legislation that he had introduced:

"I have introduced an initiative (to) allow a rescission of spending authority to be enacted should the President and a majority of both houses agree to it. Without making any changes in the constitutional balance of powers, my proposal would guarantee congressional action on presidential proposals to reduce or eliminate spending . . . (it is) a common sense tool that the president and Congress should have at their disposal to restrain unnecessary and excessive federal spending."

Rep. Dick Armey in a "Dear Colleague" letter dated November 2, 1987 asking for support of his amendment that would allow the President to rescind items in the Continuing Resolution, subject to majority override:

"Enhanced rescission legislation will involve the Administration and the Congress in a meaningful deficit reduction process in a manner that ensures both institution's prerogatives are protected."

Rep. Gerald Solomon during a debate on the House floor on July 30, 1992, in support of his effort to make in order an amendment to grant the President expedited rescission authority:

"If we defeat the previous question, I will offer the Carper line-item rescission amendment that simply requires Congress to vote up or down on the President's request not to

spend the money. This requires only a simple majority vote . . . For those of you who really believe in the line-item veto, we have reached a tremendous compromise here that you can vote for. It should be something that this House can support overwhelmingly."

Rep. Harris Fawell during debate on the House floor (October 2, 1992) on H.R. 2164, expedited rescission legislation passed by the House:

"This bill is at least the first step of a 1,000 mile journey toward hopefully someday being able to balance the federal budget."

Statement of (Bush) Administration Policy issued by the Office of Management and Budget on October 2, 1992 regarding H.R. 2164:

"Enactment of H.R. 2164 would temporarily increase congressional accountability for 'pork barrel' spending in the appropriations process."

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT FOR EXPEDITED RESCISSION 99TH CONGRESS Bills introduced

S. Con. Res. 65—The Porkbusters Resolution of 1985. Introduced by Senator Dan Quayle (R-IN) on September 17, 1985. Required Congress to vote on resolutions approving Presidential rescissions by a majority vote within fifteen days after the rescission was submitted.

H.R. 3675—a bill providing the President with modified rescission authority while preserving the authority of Congress in the budget process. Introduced by Rep. Ralph Regula (R-OH) on November 1, 1985. Required Congressional votes on Presidential rescissions within 45 days.

Floor consideration

On September 19, 1985, Senator Quayle offered the text of S. Con. Res. 65 as an amendment to the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1986. The amendment was ruled non-germane and defeated on a procedural motion of 34-62.

100TH CONGRESS

Bills introduced

S. Con. Res. 16—a bill providing for expedited consideration of a bill or joint resolution approving a Presidential rescission. Introduced by Senator Quayle on February 5, 1987. The bill was cosponsored by two Republicans. (See attached statement in Congressional Record)

H. Con. Res. 119—similar to S. Con. Res. 16. Introduced by Rep. Lynn Martin (R-NY) on May 8, 1987. Cosponsored by 15 Republicans.

H.R. 3129—Line-item Rescission Act of 1987. Introduced by Rep. Tim Johnson (D-SD) on August 6, 1987. Cosponsored by 20 Republicans, including Rep. Gerald Solomon (R-NY) and Rep. Dan Coats (R-IN). (See attached Dear Colleague signed by Johnson, Solomon and others)

Floor consideration

Rep. Dick Armey (R-TX) attempted to add on amendment to the FY88 Long-term Continuing Resolution granting the President enhanced rescission authority over funds included in the CR. Under the amendment, a simple majority of Congress could overturn the rescission. The effort was unsuccessful. (See attached Dear Colleagues and floor statement).

Notable quotes

Senator Dan Quayle (February 5, 1987, S3136 Congressional Record):

"The Pork-Buster Resolution is based on a simple, fundamental premise. Before the taxpayers' money can be spent, the President

and a majority of both the Senate and the House of Representatives should be required to agree those funds should be spent. Congress should be made—and held—accountable to the American people on rescissions that a President believes are appropriate. By using the rulemaking power of each House, the Pork-Buster Resolution would require expedited consideration of Presidential rescission messages."

Rep. Dick Armey (Dear Colleague dated November 2, 1987):

"Enhanced rescission authority will involve the Administration and the Congress in a meaningful deficit reduction process in a manner that ensures both institution's prerogatives are protected."

Rep. Dick Armey (November 5, 1987, H30961 Congressional Record):

"I will go to the Rules Committee and I will request a rule that will allow me to amend that long-term continuing resolution to include in it enhanced rescission authority that would allow the President to examine that large omnibus spending bill line item by line item and make line-item vetoes, as it were, with a simple majority override capacity remaining for the House."

101ST CONGRESS

Bills introduced

H.R. 235—Line-item Rescission Act of 1989. Introduced by Rep. Tim Johnson (D-SD) on January 3, 1989. Cosponsored by 9 Republicans.

H.R. 962—Current Level Rescission Act of 1989. Introduced by Rep. Dick Armey on February 9, 1989 and cosponsored by 105 Republicans. Provided for expedited consideration of Presidential rescissions if the rescission did not reduce any program below its prior-year level. (See attached opinion editorial authored by Armey and Johnson)

H.R. 3800—a bill providing for expedited consideration of certain Presidential rescission. Introduced by Rep. Tom Carper (D-DE) along with Reps. Armey, Johnson, Martin, Dan Glickman (D-KN), Bill Frenzel (R-MN) and others as a bi-partisan consensus expedited rescission bill on November 21, 1987. Cosponsored by 65 Republicans. (See attached Dear Colleague signed by 8 Democrats and 7 Republicans)

Notable quotes

Rep. Dick Armey and Rep. Tim Johnson (Dear Colleague dated March 1, 1989):

"The Current Level Enhanced Rescission Act is a realistic, rational proposal that protects Congress' own spending priorities and restores the President's role in fighting the deficit."

102D CONGRESS

Bills introduced

H.R. 2164—a bill providing for expedited consideration of certain Presidential rescissions. Introduced by Rep. Carper on May 1, 1991. Cosponsored by 108 Republicans. Required votes in Congress on Presidential rescissions within ten days of their submission. Limited the amount that the President could rescind authorized programs to 25%. Established the new procedure for two years. (See attached Dear Colleague)

H.R. 5700—Expedited Consideration of Proposed Rescissions Act of 1992. Introduced by Rep. Solomon on July 28, 1992. Identical to H.R. 2164 except that it eliminated the distinction between authorized and unauthorized programs included in H.R. 2164.

Floor consideration

July 30, 1992—Rep. Solomon attempted to defeat the previous question on the Commerce, Justice and State Appropriations bill

so that he could offer a motion to make in order what he described as "a slightly different line-item veto rescission amendment" which consisted of the text of his expedited rescission bill. Reps. Bob McEwan (R-OH), David Drier (R-CA), John Duncan (R-TN) and Bob Walker (R-PA) spoke in support of Solomon's motion. The effort failed on a vote of 240-176.

October 3, 1992—The House passed H.R. 2164, the expedited rescission bill introduced by Rep. Tom Carper, by a vote of 312-197. It was supported by 154 of 159 Republicans voting.

Notable quotes

Rep. Dick Armey (May 5, Rules Committee Hearing on H.R. 4990):

"I think the President's authority should be enhanced, perhaps enhanced in the way Mr. Solomon suggests, but even enhancing it a little bit in the way Mr. Carper will later recommend. That would be an improvement."

Rep. Harris Fawell (R-IL) (May 5, Rules Committee Hearing):

"When Tom Carper comes up in reference to his enhanced rescission bill, it isn't everything I would want, but I could support it. It does valuable things. It moves us down the road."

Rep. Jerry Solomon (May 7, 1992, H3029 Congressional Record):

"We moved to make in order an amendment by Mr. Carper, a Democrat, and Mr. Stenholm, a Democrat, to provide for expedited rescission procedures for the next two years, similar in concept to my line item veto bill, but watered down considerably. Still, it is a strong step in the right direction."

Rep. Bob McEwan (July 30, 1992, H6988 Congressional Record):

"The Solomon amendment would mandate that Congress consider legislation approving the President's rescissions within twenty days. If either House fails to pass the bill, then the money would be obligated. Mr. Speaker, in the name of fiscal responsibility, the House must be given the opportunity to at least consider the Solomon amendment."

Rep. Jerry Solomon (July 30, 1992, H6992 Congressional Record):

"If we defeat the previous question, I will offer the Carper line-item rescission amendment that simply requires Congress to vote up or down on the President's request not to spend the money. This requires only a simple majority vote."

Rep. Jerry Solomon (July 30, 1992, H6992 Congressional Record):

"For those of you who really believe in the line-item veto, we have reached a tremendous compromise here that you can vote for. It should be something that this House can support overwhelmingly on both sides of the aisle."

Rep. Harris Fawell (October 2, 1992, H10811 Congressional Record):

"(H.R. 2164) is at least the first step of a 1,000 mile journey toward hopefully someday being able to balance the federal budget."

Rep. Jerry Solomon (October 2, 1992 H10813 Congressional Record):

"I favor the bill before us today (H.R. 2164) because it is an improvement over the current rescission process * * *. It is a step in the right direction."

DEMOCRATS WILL REDUCE THE NATIONAL DEBT

(Mr. BARLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. BARLOW. Madam Speaker, in the last election the American people voted against gridlock: specifically, gridlock of a Republican Party; more specifically, gridlock of a Republican Party when it is in the Presidency.

Now, do not say to me, "Well, the gridlock was because we had a Republican President and a Democratic Congress, and he couldn't move his program through a Democratic Congress."

Madam Speaker, here is the record of what Republicans in the last 12 years sent to the Hill: deficits every year, and the documents they sent to the Hill that have increased our national debt by over \$3 trillion.

Madam Speaker, the first big economic improvement that President Clinton delivered has been a drop in interest rates because he has focused us on the problems of our budget and our national debt. For each 1-percent drop in interest rates, \$50 billion is being delivered in improvements to the American people.

The Democratic Party is going to lead us to a balanced budget, and then it is going to reduce our national debt.

Madam Speaker, for the RECORD I include the figures I referred to earlier.

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget sent to Hill by Reagan/Bush	1st budget resolution reported by Senate/House conference	Actual annual deficit total
1981	2.2	0.2	79.0
1982	61.7	37.6	128.0
1983	107.2	103.9	207.8
1984	202.8	171.6	185.4
1985	195.2	181.2	212.3
1986	180.0	171.9	221.2
1987	143.6	142.6	149.8
1988	107.8	108.0	155.2
1989	129.5	135.3	152.5
1990	91.1	98.7	221.4
1991	63.1	64.0	269.5
1992	280.9	278.8	290.2
1993	349.9	326.6	310.0

Note.—Numbers verified by Congressional Budget Office and the Congressional Research Service.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STUMP) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 60 minutes, on April 29.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOAGLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REYNOLDS, for 5 minutes, on April 28.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STUMP) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. BEREUTER.

Mr. HYDE.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.

Mr. WAXMAN in two instances.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. TORRES.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. DOOLEY.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 5, 1993:

H.R. 1. An act to grant family and temporary medical leave under certain circumstances.

On February 18, 1993:

H.J. Res. 101. A joint resolution to designate February 21 through February 27, 1993, as "National FFA Organization Awareness Week".

On March 4, 1993:

H.R. 920. An act to extend the emergency unemployment program, and for other purposes.

On March 17, 1993:

H.R. 750. An act to extend the Export Administration Act of 1979 and to authorize appropriations under that act for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

On March 26, 1993:

H.R. 904. An act to amend the Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992 with respect to the establishment of the national Commission to ensure a strong competitive airline industry.

On March 31, 1993:

H.J. Res. 150. A joint resolution designating April 2, 1993, as "Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.".

On April 5, 1993:

H.J. Res. 156: A joint resolution concerning the dedication of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum.

H.R. 239: An act to amend the Stock Raising Homestead Act to resolve certain problems regarding subsurface estates, and for other purposes.

On April 6, 1993:

H.R. 1430: An act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit.

On April 22, 1993:

H.R. 1335: An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 28, 1993, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1107. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the fiscal year 1994 request for appropriations for the Department of the Interior, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-78); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1108. A letter from the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's fourth special impoundment message for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685 (H. Doc. No. 103-79); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1109. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a report on the impact of section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1989, pursuant to Public Law 101-157, section 6(i) (103 Stat. 944); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1110. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Argentina for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 93-11), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1111. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Pamela Harriman, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to France, and members of her family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1112. A letter from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the Inter-American Foundation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1113. A letter from the Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1114. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1115. A letter from the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the PBGC's second management report, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1116. A letter from the Solicitor, United States Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1992, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1117. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on the Presidential Public Funding Program; to the Committee on House Administration.

1118. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the "High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program 1992 Interim Report," pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 390g-2(c)(2); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1119. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for the Office of the United States Trade Representative; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1120. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 note; jointly, to the Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

1121. A letter from the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 1801(a) (104 Stat. 1755); jointly, to the Committee on Armed Services and Science, Space, and Technology.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself, Mr. COX, Mr. KYL, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. Boucher):

H.R. 1863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to education savings accounts and to provide that amounts paid from such an account for educational expenses shall never be subject to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WISE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. SOLOMON, Ms. FOWLER, and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 1864. A bill to establish the Social Security Administration as an independent agency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. APPELEGATE, and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 1865. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to States for the purposes of financing the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of water supply systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DE LUGO:

H.R. 1866. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to make permanent certain provisions relating to verification of wages and issuance of duty refund certificates to insure producers in the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOOLEY (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Ms.

LONG, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EWING, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CANADY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. GUNDERSON):

H.R. 1867. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act with respect to public health pesticides; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1868. A bill to prohibit the lifting of the United States embargo of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H.R. 1869. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of paintings imported for the use of any public library, and other public institution, or any nonprofit institution established for educational, scientific, literary, or philosophical purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 1870. A bill to strengthen the competitiveness of the U.S. motor vehicle sector by creating a Motor Vehicle Industry Competitiveness Commission; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Foreign Affairs, and Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1871. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to report to Congress on the long-term needs of veterans in the state of New Jersey for nursing home care and on the feasibility of providing a State home construction grant to that State to assist in the construction of a new nursing home in central New Jersey to meet the nursing home needs of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming:

H.R. 1872. A bill to provide flexibility in education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1873. A bill to require certain payments made to victims of Nazi persecution to be disregarded in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits or services based on need; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHAEFER (for himself and Mr. VENTO):

H.J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to designate June 5, 1993, as "National Trails Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution concerning economic sanctions against and diplomatic resolutions with the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution recognizing and commending American airmen held as prisoners of war at the Buchenwald concentration camp during World War II for their service, bravery, and fortitude; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

98. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to California military bases; to the Committee on Armed Services.

99. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to March Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

100. Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Los Angeles Air Force Base; to the Committee on Armed Services.

101. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, relative to Federal banking laws; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

102. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to K-12 education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

103. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Delaney Clause; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

104. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Federal mandates upon the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

105. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Endangered Species Act listings; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

106. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

107. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Federal budget deficit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

108. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

109. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Bruneau Hot Springs snail; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

110. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the operation of the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

111. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Argonne National Laboratory; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

112. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

113. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to a national energy tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

114. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to western national forests; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Natural Resources.

115. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Operation Restore Hope; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

116. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to foreign imports of petroleum; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and Energy and Commerce.

117. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to governmental oversight; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

118. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to immigrants; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.
H.R. 259: Mr. VALENTINE.
H.R. 393: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. TORRICELLI.
H.R. 410: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 411: Mr. HASTERT.
H.R. 415: Mr. KYL.
H.R. 519: Ms. MEEK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. SCHENK, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 546: Mr. HAMBURG, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.
H.R. 567: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 684: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 715: Mr. DELAY, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 784: Ms. CANTWELL.
H.R. 903: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 929: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 995: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1036: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 1076: Mr. MCHALE, Mr. GLICKMAN, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1200: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1404: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FROST, Mr. SARPALIS, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1405: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FROST, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1492: Mr. BLACKWELL and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1513: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. SARPALIS.
H.R. 1565: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. SPENCE.
H.R. 1697: Mrs. MINK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr.

KREIDLER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H.R. 1753: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1754: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1755: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BLACKWELL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. STUMP and Mr. SPENCE.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MANN, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BILLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SWETT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HUITO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. DINGELL.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. COX, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. STOKES, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. BYRNE.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. OLVER, Mr. KLING, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H. Con. Res. 46: Mr. FROST, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Res. 123: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 124: Mr. INGLIS and Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 127: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. ZELIFF.

H. Res. 154: Mr. RAMSTAD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1013: Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

31. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, NY, relative to a proposal to simplify interest deductions for individuals; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.